PRANAVA-VADA

VOL. III.

PRINTED BY
ANNIE BESANT
VASANTA PRESS
ADYAR MADRAS

THE SCIENCE OF THE SACRED WORD

BEING A SUMMARISED TRANSLATION

OF

THE PRANAVA-VADA

OF

GARGYAYANA

BY

BHAGAVAN DAS, M.A.

with notes by Annie Besant

VOL. III.

Theosophical Publishing House, Adyar, Madras, India

1913

For permission to translate apply to

THEOSOPHICAL PUBLISHING HOUSE, Adyar, Madras, India.

TO

THE HUMAN RACE

For whose helping the Compássionate Sage

GARGYAYANA

Composed the original.

CONTENTS

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XXVII.

PARĀ AND APARĀ-PRAKṚṬI.

Light and shade as Parā and Aparā-prakṛṭi.—Jīvāṭmā as the third.—The next stage of condensation as saṭṭva, rajas and ṭamas; corresponding to Āṭma-(or Jīvāṭma-) prakṛṭi, Parā and Aparā respectively.—Endless repetitions of these and further and further condensations.—Manas, buḍḍhi, and ahaṅkāra.—Chiṭṭa, mahaṭṭva and mamaṭva.—Thence three ākāshas.—Thence three vāyus, and so on.—Endless triplets, even denser than earth.—Other counts, by sevens, etc.—Formations of atoms by action and re-action.

New facts and names arise out of this conjunction of light and shade that was described in the preceding chapter. Light is Parā-prakṛṭi; shadow is Aparā-prakṛṭi; the 'picture' born of the two is the Jīvāṭmā. Out of the conjunctions of this triplet of Parā, Aparā and Jīvāṭmā, arises the other triplet of saṭṭva, rajas, and ṭamas. The first is Āṭma-prakṛṭi, *i.e.*, the Self Itself (the possessor of the light); rajas is Parā-prakṛṭi or prakāsha, light; ṭamas (darkness) is Aparā-prakṛṭi.[1] In other words, the I is

---

[1] In the preceding chapter, Aparāṭmā was said to possess the quality of light and to reside

s a ṭ, 'being,' 'existence,' 'true,' 'good,' etc.; and the state of s a ṭ is s a ṭ-ṭ v a, goodness, reality, (cognisability because of, and as the cause

---

in Ḍaivī-prakṛṭi, while Parāṭmā corresponded with shadow and dwelt in Mūla-prakṛṭi. Here the use of parā and aparā seems to be reversed, apparently because Prakṛṭi, in combination with which they are here used, is the reverse of Āṭmā, in connexion with which they were used before. The use here corresponds with the *Upaniṣhaṭ* one regarding the lower and the higher knowledge. The reader's attention is invited to the last paragraph and footnote of ch. xviii above, to pages 280-281 of *The Science of Peace*, and also to the quotation from *Isis Unveiled*, at p. 579 (old Edn.) of *The Secret Doctrine*, I, where it is said that *spirit* and *matter* both spring from the "electric bosom" of Light. Of course, if we understand spirit and matter in their metaphysical sense, then we must regard this Light as the *Principle of Consciousness*, of 'illumination' in the sense of 'mentality'. This and the preceding and succeeding chapters deal with many duads (each with its nexus implied), *e.g.*, Āṭmā and Anāṭmā; Being and Non-Being; Ḍaivī-Prakṛṭi (in place of Praṭyagāṭmā) and Mūla-prakṛṭi; existence and non-existence; light and shade; Aparāṭmā and Parāṭmā; Parā-prakṛṭi and Aparā-prakṛṭi; spirit and matter; subject and object; soul and body; active energy and re-active energy; love and hate; etc. Metaphysically, we can scarcely distinguish

of the belief of, reality, for *esse* is *percipi*), which is nothing else than the unity of the I. The

---

grades and stages amongst *principles*; we have to regard them all as *aspects* of one and the same principle, the all-containing Trinity, and as showing forth *simultaneously*, in potentiality, what appears in manifestation *successively*, as various stages between the condition of B r a h m a n in p r a l a y a and that in an active world-system of individualised mind and particularised matter. To every one of these metaphysical or abstract aspects or principles will also correspond a more and more concrete 'veil' or 'film' of matter, as mentioned in the closing para of ch. xviii quoted above, and in *Bhagavad-Gīṭā*, vii. 4, 5; and the suggestion, quoted from *The Secret Doctrine*, in *Occult Chemistry* by (Annie Besant and C. W. Leadbeater), that the æther of space, or *Koilon*, the ultimate substance of our visible sidereal system, is the seventh grade of density of Mūla-p r a k ṛ ṭ i, would fit in with the statements of the *Praṇava-Vāda* very well, only if we understand M ū l a-p r a k ṛ ṭ i in the concrete sense of the ultimate material of a higher system (*e.g.*, we are told elsewhere that our sun is a sun of the fourth order), and not in the abstract, metaphysical, sense of Root-matter, mere Objectivity, Not-Self, which is just equally far from or equally near to *any* particular density of matter of *any* particular system, and cannot be graded to any in any numerical terms. For concrete illustrations of these divisions and sub-divisions of *principles*, we

This is rajas, kriyā. The third is ṭamas, the means of their connexion and conjunction.

These repeat themselves endlessly, in the same way as plants, animals and humans do. The human being is born (rajas); grows and acquires knowledge (saṭṭva); then, in youth, he falls into ṭamas, desire, and as a consequence, new human beings arise from him; and so on, endlessly. This occurs everywhere, and everywhere do we see samvṛḍḍhi, growth, evolution, in sṛṣhti, emanation, creation, the manifested world. Also, everywhere do we see a growth of and in density. Translation, transformation, from the sūkṣhma or subtle into the sṭhūla or gross, is the law

---

might consider the 'Bright Space' and 'Dark Space' of *The Secret Doctrine*, the 'Male and Female atoms' of *Occult Chemistry*, the 'nucleus and protoplasm, linin and chromatin, centrosomes and chromosomes etc.', (and their bisections) of physiology, (*vide* also *Manu Samhiṭa*, i. 5—32). These correspond to Āṭmā and Prakṛṭi and their sub-divisions; while the various 'forces' at work, reproduction and metabolism, vitality and intelligence, prâṇa and buḍḍhi, free-will and fate, initiative and automatic or mechanical causation, etc., correspond to the sub-divisions of Ḍaivī-prakṛṭi or Mâyâ—all such sub-divisions arising out of the endless aḍhyâsa or mutual inversed reflexions of Self and Not-Self.

of succession in this world-system (at its present stage). We are not speaking here about other world-systems (nor of distant future stages of this) having no clear and detailed knowledge of them; because, while principles are of universal application, details are matter of succession, of the limited. And in the realm of the limited and successive, the limitation and succession determine each stage or condition; that, in turn, determines the memory; memory,[1] the knowledge; and, finally, as our knowledge so our description of the world.

The next triplet that arises is manas, buḍḍhi and ahaṅkāra. Manas is rājasa. Buḍḍhi is sāṭṭvika. Ahaṅkāra is ṭāmasa.[2] These are, as it were, intermediate

[1] Memory may here be regarded as standing for, or corresponding to, the inner, liṅga or *type*-body which governs the life and experiences of the outer body from birth to death.

[2] In the current *Purāṇas* and *Upaniṣhaṭs*, manas corresponds with chanḍramā, the moon, Brahmā (who was born as Soma, or the moon from Aṭṭri and Anasūyā), āpas, reṭas, rajas, etc., buḍḍhi with saṭṭva and Viṣhṇu; ahaṅkāra with Ruḍra, the self-assertive and other-destructive form of Shiva-desire. The 'location' of these 'aspects' of mind, chiṭṭa, manas, buḍḍhi, ahaṅkāra (and smṛṭi, according

between the elements of I and This of which the jīva is composed; and appear because the jīva, as jīva, has certain work to do. That is to say, they are needed to to make its life, its work, possible. First comes cognition through the senses; it is the picturing of objects, by means of the senses, in the manas, which (picturing) is rendered possible only by the metaphysical or transcendental fact that everything exists everywhere. Here arises

---

to some of the minor *Upaniṣhaṭs*, though others identify it with chiṭṭa); or, in terms of different systems of devotional meditation, Mahā-Vishṇu or Āḍīnārāyaṇa, Vāsuḍeva, Saṅkarṣhaṇa, Praḍyumna, Aniruḍḍha (of the Vaiṣhṇavas); or Saḍyojāṭa, Aghora, Vāmaḍeva, Ṭaṭpuruṣha and Īshāna (of the Shaivas; etc., etc.; in the nerve-centres, chakras, etc., is given variously, in various *Yoga* and *Ṭanṭra*-works, including some of the 'minor' *Upaniṣhaṭs*. To understand the significance of each fully and so reconcile them all, much occult knowledge would be needed. We can only make guesses. *E.g.*, the seat of Ruḍra and ahaṅkāra is said to be in the head, but it manifests in its intensest form at the lower pole of the human magnet, in the procreative organs. On the other hand, the seat of buḍḍhi, by one account, (of chiṭṭa,) by another), is in the navel, but it manifests in the head in the functioning of the sensors and the brain. The seat of manas is in the heart; its manifestation in various glands and organs. Sometimes

the ā k ā ṅ k ṣ h ā, the query, 'desire' (to know): This external object—how does or can or may it enter into me?[1] (So far m a n a s). The b u ḍ ḍ h i determines: This is so and so and not such and such; it is true; or, it is false; necessary; or, unnecessary; avoidable; or, unavoidable; obtainable; or, not; and so on. What ought to be done and what ought not to be done, is all decided by the b u ḍ ḍ h i. A h a ṅ k ā r a says: I will do whatever has been determined by the b u ḍ ḍ h i. It is a b h i m ā n a, self-measuring, self-regard, self-reliance, self-respect, pride (in one aspect).

The next triplet is c h i ṭ ṭ a, m a h a ṭ ṭ v a and m a m a ṭ v a; A, U and M respectively. Thence arise the three ā k ā s h a s; thence, the three v ā y u s; thence, the three ṭ e j a s'; thence, the ā p a s; thence, the p ṛ ṭ h i v ī s; and so on, always in triplets.

In the p ṛ ṭ h i v ī-stage all (preceding triplets) are reflected. Herein too is reached the fullest s ṭ h ū l a, the extreme limit of density, so far as our world-system is concerned (it should be borne in mind); for, in reality, there is no final

---

all these are assigned centres in the head only; and then, probably, what is meant is that certain centres in the brain correspond with and govern certain centres in the body.

[1] See Sec. II, *supra*.

superlative of subtle or gross anywhere in the Endless World-Process, and there are numberless ṭaṭṭvas, in similar triplets, *after* pṛṭhivī also.[1]

In another aspect, from another standpoint, the count is by sevens, instead of threes. Each triplet is expanded into a septenary. Thus we have the seven ṭaṭṭvas, mahaṭ, buḍḍhi

---

[1] And presumably, by parity of reasoning, *before* ākāsha or anupāḍaka or āḍi (here called mahaṭ and buḍḍhi-ṭaṭṭvas, as also in the *Vāyu* and other *Purāṇas*). There is usually felt a certain difficulty in conceiving greater grades of density than that of pṛṭhivī, with reference to the fact that birds live and move about *in* air and fish *in* water, whereas men and quadrupeds live and move about only *on* earth. We find it difficult to conceive of creatures living and moving about *in* earth, as they ought to be able to do, if their bodies are composed of denser matter than the earth, carrying on the analogy of the fish and the birds, *i.e.*, the denser is able to move about in the subtler, without affecting the condition of the latter (and presumably *vice versā*); but we cannot conceive of diamond moving about in common rock without pulverising the latter. The difficulty may possibly be solved by a few metaphysical and psychological considerations. What we describe in 'physical' terms as 'dense and subtle,' in 'psychical' terms, terms of consciousness, means and can be translated into nothing else than 'resistant and non-resistant.' The *ideas* of absolute resistance

and the well-known five. And so on. This system of septenaries prevails through our particular b r a h m ā ṇ d a of our s a m s ā r a. There are other b r a h m ā ṇ d a s in which the count is not by sevens, where there is or are only one or two, three, four, or five ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s, and so on. But there too, the triplicity of the Universal Principle takes effect and shows itself in some way or other. Thus, even though

and non-resistance, plenum and vacuum, Not-Self and Self (or Self and Not-Self, as we choose to look at the matter), when translated into *realities*, become endless degrees and grades of density and subtlety, for *absolute* density and *absolute* emptiness are not to be found in the limited and concrete. Thus endless grades and shades may be named variously as solids, quagmires, gums, viscosities, jellies, liquids, fluids, fogs, smokes, airs, gases, ethers, and so on. But the basic facts are two, resistance and non-resistance; and two only. Now if this be so it will be a matter of the particular constitution of a creature's body whether ā k ā s h a is dense to it and p ṛ ṭ h i v ī subtle, or *vice versā*. And, as a further step, we can see that to a differently constituted class of j ī v a-bodies, the density or 'resistance' that is to us associated with earth will be associated with another ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a, 'after' earth, and the subtlety or 'non-resistance' that we attach to water and air will be attached *by them* to earth and water respectively. This next ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a of which those bodies are made up will

there be only one ṭaṭṭva forming the material of a brahmāṇda, as for instance, ākāsha only, or ṭejas only, in that single ṭaṭṭva will appear first a duality (of inner and outer, core and crust, soul and sheath) and then a trinity, by adding on a connecting nexus, and finally, a septenate, all by means of sub-divisions of the same ṭaṭṭva.[1]

Such are the manifold details arising out of considerations of kriyā and praṭikriyā,

---

be *differently* composed in its molecular and atomic arrangement from 'earth,' and so be able to pass through earth without pulverising it. It is when we try to picture the 'next denser' in terms of nothing else than earth—as diamond to rock—that we find ourselves baffled. And, as a fact, we are told that the 'gnomes of the underworld' are such nature-spirits as can move *through* rocks, etc., even as we move through air, and yet are invisible to us.

[1] It should be borne in mind that "nothing in the world is single; all things by a law divine, in one another's being mingle;" and that no brahmāṇda, however composed, can stand by itself, wholly out of touch with all others. And if in touch, then it must latently possess all possible aspects also. Everything is everywhere and always. Hence any single ṭaṭṭva contains sub-divisions showing aspects of all others. Vide *Secret Doctrine*, Vol. III. 'Occult papers'. Endless repetition and analogy are the guiding clue.

action and re-action. In reality, the only Shakṭi in the World-process is the Shakṭi of the Self (as affirming-denying the Not-Self). And this Shakṭi works of itself, by and as Necessity, in every atom, mechanically or automatically, from the transcendental standpoint; and all individual power, energy, rule, governance, guidance, initiative, by Mahā-Viṣhṇus or atoms is therefore equally 'illusion,' though a fact, from the empirical or experiential standpoint, and a fact which is indefeasibly part and parcel of the whole scheme of the World-process (exactly as much as the feeling of separate individuality is also such a fact). Such is the true significance of kriyā and praṭikriyā, between Self and Not-Self.

And one of the primary results, from the concrete standpoint, of this true significance of the pair of Action and Re-action is the formation of aṇus and paramāṇus, atoms and superatoms of various degrees, each grade being itself formed out of combinations of subtler subdivisions of the seven ṭaṭṭvas, and in turn becoming the basis of a denser manifestation of the same ṭaṭṭvas, etc.[1]

---

[1] Vide *Occult Chemistry*, by Annie Besant and C. W. Leadbeater.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XXVIII.

SPIRIT AND MATTER.

The seven ṭaṭṭvas.—All as one element, 'matter'.—Their grouping into threes under the stress of the triplicity of consciousness.—Mahaṭ, buḍḍhi and âkâsha.—Vāyu, ṭejas and āpas.—Summation in pṛṭhivī.—Evolution and involution of these ṭaṭṭvas in correspondence with the Paths of Pursuit and of Renunciation followed by the jīva.—Explanation, in terms of the seven ṭaṭṭvas, of the nine ḍravyas of the *Vaisheṣhika*.—Of the twenty-five ḍravyas (or paḍârṭhas or ṭaṭṭvas) of *Sāṅkhya*.—Of the twenty-five guṇas or qualities.—Of the five karmas.—Summing up of all in kriyā and praṭikriyā.—Metaphysical transcendence of the Self.

These seven ṭaṭṭvas that have been mentioned above may, in one aspect, be all regarded as one element,[1] for, from the standpoint of the

[1] See preceding footnote, p. 3, and the statement in *The Secret Doctrine* III. "Occult papers," how the seven planes of our system make one Prakṛṭic plane. 'Prakṛṭic plane' there is likely to give rise to an impression that Mūla-prakṛṭi has seven planes finally. This can scarcely be so. The whole of the *Praṇava-vāḍa* goes to show that these 'fittings

Universal Self, the whole of the Many makes a one also. But ordinarily the three ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s, m a h a ṭ, b u ḍ ḍ h i and ā k ā s h a, come first, on the ground that wherever there is the Self, (and it is everywhere) there its purpose, p r a- y o j a n a, its inspiration or functioning (in cognition, desire and action) must also be.

The b u ḍ ḍ h i-ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a is cognitional. The m a h a ṭ, actional. The ā k ā s h a, negational or desiderative. (Why is m a h a ṭ mentioned first ?). Because there is no before or after from the point of view of B r a h m a n (and so any one might be mentioned first; and secondly, because) from the point of view of the limited and concrete, this Self, as the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says, stands moveless between k r i y ā on the one side and v i k r i y ā on the other.[1] Between

---

in' and subdivisions and sub-sumptions must be literally endless, and yet each atom, each plane, each subdivision, each world-system, must of necessity be organically articulated with all the rest, so that the limits of any world-system, at any given time and place are always conventional. Thus, one sun with his seven or nine or ten or twelve planets is not only an independent unit side by side with other suns, but is also an organic cell in the system of a vaster sun, and so on endlessly.

[1] K r i y ā, being manifestation, naturally *appears* first. Brahmā is named first in the trinity of the Gods. V i k r i y ā has been said (ch. xxiv)

these two (action and negation), comes buḍḍhi. Ākāsha is kham, space, vacuum, cipher, negation; and therefore comes after mahaṭ, and buḍḍhi.

Thus we have ākāsha corresponding to the M, buḍḍhi to A, and mahaṭ to U. In this we see an inversion of the primal Logion. Brahman is defined as I-this-not-am, which has two parts obviously, I-This-am and This-not-am (I). The third part thereof is the inversion, This-I-not-am, which describes the Samsāra, the World-process (in its Totality, identical with Brahman, and yet also an inversion of It, for it is conceived as an Endless Flow, rather than an Eternal Rest). The forum or locus, the 'standing-place,' of the I is the This; and from the standpoint of the World-process, the house has to be provided before the occupant can come in. Hence the precedence given to mahaṭ.

As mahaṭ and buḍḍhi arise out of the opposition of the unity of I and This, so ākāsha, corresponding with negation, arises out of their re-mergence into Unity, and includes both.

---

to correspond with negation or desire. From the standpoint of this particular triplet, then, of kriyā, praṭikriyā, vikriyā (with which this very long Section III of many chapters is concerned), the succession of the elements takes the particular order here given.

Hence the common sayings that all things appear in ākāsha, and that all is born from sound, the quality, of ākāsha; also that Brahman is like or even is ākāsha. The difference between Brahman and shūnya[1] or vacuum may be stated as the difference between one and two, *i.e.*, vacuum is relative to plenum and implies a duality, whereas Brahman is all-inclusive—an Absolute which includes all possible pairs of relatives and is not separate from or outside of these, but *is* the Totality of them all, remembering that the pairs are pairs of opposites and so in the totalisation become abolished, plus and minus summed up making zero.

The next triplet of ṭaṭṭvas is vāyu, ṭejas, āpas. Vāyu is Not-Self. Ṭejas, Self. Āpas, negation. Vāyu is born from

[1] One of the names for vacuum is ākāsha, although the word properly means a certain kind of matter of a certain density, This is so, because, *comparatively*, the ākāsha-matter of our system is *as* empty space, to the denser kinds. Compare the statements in *The Secret Doctrine re* "Fohat making holes in space," and the views of *Occult Chemistry re* "holes or bubbles in koilon". In Samskṛṭ philosophy, while one of the properties of ākāsha is sound, another is avakāsha-ḍāna 'yielding place, making room' for others.

ākāsha. Hence the work or the functioning of ākāsha is possible therein. Again, because vāyu is connected with the sense-quality of touch, therefore is it always of the nature of kriyā, action, restless movement. So ṭejas, being connected with visual rūpa, form, is related to cognition which observes the appearance of all things everywhere. Āpas, pursuing the union of the two, is the balancing, equalisation, sāmyaṭva, of the two.[1] No oppositions appear in the waters, (they are all-lubricating, uniform, helping things to hold together). This statement is of course only comparative, as usual. Strictly, there are vikṛṭis, transformations, in water also. The triplet of prakṛṭi, original or primal nature, or natural condition, vikṛṭi, transformation, change, developments or unfolding of the nature, and praṭikṛṭi, redemption, reversion to nature—is universal. Thus, we have negation of negation also.

[1] Probably, one manifestation of this idea, a translation of the ideal into the real, is the chemical fact that oxygen and hydrogen in combination form water, the one helpful to the activity of organisms, the other inflammable in itself. The correspondence between ṭaṭṭvas and psychological processes here indicated, may be profitably pursued in theosophical literature and the minor *Upanishaṭs* and the *Ṭanṭras*. The word sāmyaṭva would be sāmya in modern Samskṛṭ.

Pṛṭhivī is the summation of all these six and 'pervades' them all (*i.e.*, contains or combines them all in itself) equally.

The common statements as to *five* mahābhūṭas are based on the fact that ākāsha is regarded as summing up in itself the two preceding elements.

The gradual pravarṭana and nivarṭana, evolution and involution, of these elements or ṭaṭṭvas, corresponds to the paths of pravṛṭṭi and nivṛṭṭi, pursuit and renunciation, in the life of the jīva. Pravṛṭṭi is the mutual reflexion, of the Self in the Not-Self, and of the Not-self in the Self. This mutual reflexion is the very essence of all kriyā which is the same thing as pravṛṭṭi. The reflexion of the Negation by each with reference to the other is nivṛṭṭi. Samāvṛṭṭi,[1] returning, coming back again, revolution, and nirāvṛṭṭi, 'never turning and returning,' never-moving, eternal-rest, complete the usual quartette.

The explanation of the nine ḍravyas, substances, (of the *Vaisheṣhika* system) is similar to that of the ṭaṭṭvas. They are usually enumerated as pṛṭhivī, āpas, ṭejas, vāyu, ākāsha, kāla or time, ḍik or space, Āṭmā

[1] Sometimes named anuvṛṭṭi, as in the verse of the *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, iii. 16.

or the Self, and manas or the mind. Because ḍravya or substance is (and is the immediate manifestation and embodiment of) shakṭi,[1] and Shakṭi is Necessity, and Necessity is the cause of everything, therefore are all these nine, which are the 'ultimates' of the universe (in the *Vaisheṣhika*) designated as ḍravya. Of these the first five are obviously the mahābhūṭas. The other four are connected with them (as the conditions of their existence).

(The original forms of) these (five) ṭaṭṭvas (proper, or mahābhūṭas, with four modifications each) in reference to time, space, Self and mind, give rise to the twenty-five ḍravyas.[2]

So, again, we have twenty-four guṇas or qualities (as also mentioned in the *Vaisheṣhika*), one guṇa connected with each ḍravya, the twenty-fifth being the summation of all the others (and corresponding with the Self). These qualities are visibility, tastability, smellability,

---

[1] In the *Viṣhṇu-Bhāgavaṭa*, ḍravya is often substituted for ichchhâ, and the triplet is spoken of द्रव्यज्ञानक्रियात्मकम्. In the *Ḍevi-Bhāgavaṭa* the more obvious expression इच्छाज्ञानक्रियाश्रयम् is used to characterise the nervous system.

[2] Of *Sāṅkhya*, apparently; manas or mind probably corresponds with motion, to complete the triplet of space, time and motion. Manas is 'restless'.

tangibility, number or countability, size or measurability, attachability (or cohesiveness), detachability (or repulsiveness), priority or superiority, posteriority or inferiority, weight, fluidity (like that of air), liquidity or lubricancy (like that of water), audibility, cognition or thinking, pleasantness or pleasure, painfulness or pain, desire or inclination or affinity, aversion (or diffinity), will or exertiveness, merit or meritoriousness, sin or sinfulness, potentiality or tendency or aptitude.[1]

The karmas, actions, are five, as might be inferred from the statements as to pañchi-karaṇa, quintuplication of the five ṭaṭṭvas. Two are connected with ḍravya and guṇa, *viz.*, 'throwing up' and 'throwing down,' vibration in opposite directions, ascent and descent, rising and falling, growth and decay, birth and dissolution. 'Going,' expansion and contraction are forms of these (or *vice versā*). Prāpṭi, approach, 'finding,' in the direction of birth or of dissolution is 'going,' gamana. A series,

---

[1] This list is somewhat different from that given in current works on *Vaisheṣhika*. The indication in the text that each quality corresponds predominantly with one ḍravya, and that the ḍravyas arise as modifications of the primary five, is very suggestive, and might, if worked out, give satisfactory explanations of what now appears fanciful, as put in the current Samskṛṭ books.

an unbroken, or growing, succession of births is prasāraṇa, expansion. So, too, an incessant or growing succession of deaths or dissolutions is kuñchana, contraction.[1] Both are possible only in space. And these, as well as gamana, and also ascent and descent, etc., are all included in and may be understood by the two main words, kriyā and pratikriyā.

These, kriyā and praṭikriyā, make the downward arc and the upward arc, the paths of pursuit and renunciation, attachment and detachment, along which each jīva impels itself, of and by Necessity, which Necessity manifests as desire in the jīvas and between them, being but a transformation of the primal and eternal unity of the One Self.[2]

But, in reality, there are no such things at all.

> Why should the Self pursue, and whom, and what?
>
> And what and whom and why may It renounce?

---

[1] Compare the modern scientific views as to necrobiosis, metabolism and the integration and disintegration of molecular living tissue.

[2] See *Viṣhṇu-Bhāgavaṭa*, XI. xxii., for a similar reconciliation of different systems of thought. Indeed, with the help of changes of standpoint, all philosophies whatsoever can be translated into terms of Self, Not-Self and Negation, and all concrete sciences into terms of the ṭaṭṭvas.

No rise and fall, no ascent and descent,
It needs or undergoes! What motive! Why!
It hath no need of earth, water or fire,
Or air or ether or still subtler things,
Or denser, with their endless qualities,
Odors and tastes, colors and tacts and sounds,
And feels for which our race hath yet no names,
Or numbers, measures, junctions and disjunctions!
It is not Separate, It is not One,
Not of a higher or a lower grade,
Not highest multiple of numbered finites,
Not genus, nor yet species, broad or slim!
It has no weight, It has no liquid flow,
It gains no merit, It acquires no sin,
It layeth up no thirsts, no tendencies,
No instincts, cravings, possibilities,
Samskāras, potencies, for good or ill,
Or faculties to think and feel and plan,
Attachments or detachments, pull or push,
Attraction or repulsion, love or hate,
Affinity or feud, cohesion, breach,
Orbits or cycles, straight or circling rush,
Action, re-action—All are naught to It,
That e'er abideth Motionless, Supreme,
Eternal Consciousness of Self alone.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XXIX.

The Psychology of Kriyā and Praṭikriyā —Love and Hate.

Restatement of basic principles.—The Primal Sūṭrâṭmâ or Thread of Unity.—Its reflexion into pseudo-infinite threads of individuality.—All the functions of life and operations of the world based on and made possible only by these threads, which hold together all discretes and bring about all the interplay between them.—The interdependence of all, jīvas and ṭaṭṭvas.—The necessity of all, from the transcendental standpoint.—The necessity of dealing with one side of a question at a time, from the empirical standpoint.—Sūṭrâṭmâs as laws.—The explanation of lawlessness and disorder.—The psychological aspects of the thread-soul, (the law of individual being, character, principle, etc.)—Râga and ḍvesha or Love and Hate.

(Some restatements of the basic principles may be made now in a somewhat new aspect, as a preliminary to the discussions of the emotions which lead to kriyā, in the life of individual jīvas.) In the Logion, I-This-Not, what subsists between the I and the This in the nature of inter-dependence, be it cognition or anything else—

that is the sūṭra, the thread. And so also as between I and not, This and not, Not and I, Not and This. This is the original, primal and universal Sūṭra or Sūṭrāṭmā, the Thread-Self. In imitation or reflexion thereof (*i.e.*, of the metaphysical Idea threading the empirical concrete) there arise endless limited sūṭrāṭmās, thread-souls or group-souls, individualities, graded as higher and lower, which, as stated before, serve as bonds of connexion between world-systems existing side by side with each other in an endless series, and also between the various parts of each world-system, the various organs within each organism.

These threads of individuality, it should be noted, are not only the basis of the appearance of unity. The appearance, the recognition, the operations of separateness and manyness are also possible only within and by means of such sūṭrāṭmās. (For just as unity is realised against a counterfoil of diversity alone, so diversity cannot be realised except against a background of unity.) Completeness, incompleteness, perfection, imperfection, advice, gift, acceptance, resignation, indifference, expectation, indeed each and all of the conventions of life are possible only within the limits of a concrete limited anyānyaṭva, other-and-other-ness, which is

yet based on and is a sameness, a oneness in manyness, identity in difference, similarity in diversity; and such is the sūṭrāṭmā. Otherwise, each one would be entirely self-absorbed, self-complete, without any commerce with any other. 'You are needed here,' 'I am wanted there,' 'I shall go there,' 'you come here,' 'you have done this,' 'I have not done this' —all such (co-operative and comparative) thinking and acting depends upon the sūṭra.

It is true that, sometimes, out of jealousy also, such (apparently dissociative) reflexions arise as that 'I am such and thou art such,' 'I am not like thee,' 'thou art not like me,' etc. But even this is possible only because of the thread-soul. The bhāva, emotion, idea, intention, of īrṣhyā, jealousy, is this: I have arrived at this very superior condition, and yet this other has also become or is becoming equal to me; he must not pass to a higher status. Or: I have arrived at this state with so much trouble and effort; how shouldst thou, how should another, achieve it also? Or, (in its triumphant aspect): You cannot, how can you, arrive at my heights! In all this, no doubt, there is apparent only an insistence upon separateness. But, looking beneath the surface appearance, we see that the separation is insisted on only within a possibility

of similarity or equality, sameness, oneness. Jealousy arises when the idea of unity is subordinated, and manyness emphasised and exaggerated. Briefly the two are interdependent.

To take another illustration, from the ṭaṭṭvas. The work of ākāsha is not possible without the presence of vāyu. Vāyu is the carrier of sound and without it there would be no hearing, though sound is the quality of ākāsha. Further, without ṭejas too the work of both ākāsha and vāyu would be impossible, for though vāyu *carries* sound, it could not *hold* it.[1]

[1]See *The Science of Peace*, p. 295. Although the expressions, 'one on one,' and 'two on two,' occur in the text later, yet perhaps, in fact, 'three' would be the minimum working number for any 'procession'—as has been said in *The Science of Peace*, in connexion with the explanation of the word ṭribhuvanam, the triple-world. For manifestation, a soul, a body and a connecting link of prāṇa-force, is the minimum wanted. But if we choose to take up a higher number, in any given cycle, then of course all the component units of that number, being but sub-divisions of the three, must appear in inseparable connexion with each other. So the three dimensions of space are the staple and basis of all calculations. All other and more dimensions can, it would seem, be but 'sub-divisions' of these. Speculating as to less than three dimensions leads us to the impassè of 'what about less than one dimension?'.

The ḍ h ā r a ṇ ā, holding, of sound would be impossible without ṭ e j a s. Ā p a s and p ṛ ṭ h i v ī are also similarly needed. This illustrates the dependence of ā k ā s h a on the others. Similarly each and all of the five are equally dependent on each and all of the others out of the five; and one on one, and two on two, and three on three, and four on four, and six on six, and seven on seven, and so on *ad infinitum.*

All this relation of each with each and all with all is the result of the nature and constitution of the s ū ṭ r a or thread which is also the n i y a m a or law (and the ḍ h a r m a or duty).

Realising this, we have yet, for practical purposes, and for the statement of the chief aspects of any fact, to become e k a-p ā k ṣ h i k a, one-sided, *i.e.*, to look at and describe one side at a time.[1] We have already seen this in reference to existence and non-existence, which two always occur in succession in practice, though simultaneous in the primal theory of the Logion; so that the existence of anything is always

[1] 'Every question has two sides,' and only one can be stated at a time. In the words of the *Yoga-Vāsiṣhṭha*, 'speech is successive'. Even such statement, of one side at a time, such inequilibrium, is the pendulum-swing of the World-process held within the clock-case of the Absolute, the to-and-fro rushing of the Prakṛṭi aspect of the Absolute, confined within the circling of the Puruṣha-aspect.

preceded as well as succeeded by its non-existence, and the non-existence of anything is also similarly inevitably preceded and succeeded by its existence.

The statement of the particular order of the succession of such aspects, one aspect at a time, in particular circumstances—is the statement of the sūṭra or niyama, thread or law, theory or rule of practice. And this too is the essential significance of nirṇaya, judgment or determination (as it is called in the *Nyāya* system), *i.e.*, the determination of the particular order (or succession of events, which is the main feature of causation, which in turn is the main object of ratiocination, relationing) that prevails in particular circumstances.[1] Otherwise, indeed, (we know once for all that) all things *are*, and so determination were meaningless and fruitless trouble.

Herein also lies the secret of the activity of knowledge, jñāna-kriyā, for it is the inherent unity of all jīvas amidst the diversity of their upāḍhis that compels each one to impart to others the knowledge that it acquires.

[1] This is 'logic' viewed in subordination to 'metaphysic'. Thus only is it saved from sterility, and becomes statesmanlike and effective for practical application and use: "This is the rule to follow and to believe in—in such and such given circumstances—*not* always absolutely".

But disease which arises ont of disorder, breach of law, goes against the universal presence and prevalence of the order implied in and by the sūṭra or thread-soul? The reply is obvious. When the diversity which is threaded together by the law into the unity which makes up and governs the organic constitution of a jīva's sheath or organism (be it an atomic animalcule or a solar system) for the time being, becomes over-accentuated and dominant, then there is the appearance of disease. The restoration of the balance, the re-establishment of the supremacy of the unity, is the remedy (physically and mentally).[1] Such is the basic aphorism of the Science of Medicine.

The 'connective-tissue' nature of the sūṭrāṭmā being thus premised, we find that in its embodiment in a jīvāṭmā, it manifests, as the *Nyāya* aphorism says, ichchhā or desire (in the sense of rāga, attraction), ḍveṣha or aversion, prayaṭna or volitional effort or activity, sukha or pleasure, ḍuhkha or pain, and

[1] Physically, the restoration of the sway of the one vital mukhya-prāṇa, over the clamorous, self-seeking minor tendencies, each 'fighting for its own hand'. Mentally, the restoration of one-pointedness to a single purpose over the sickening worries of conflicting motives and passions. Cf. E. Carpenter: *Civilisation, Its Cause and Cure.*

j ñ ā n a or cognition. The wish to be, to enjoy, to do, is manifest all around. So also is aversion.

Hate is the realisation of Manyness, separateness. It says: I am such; and such my rival, my enemy, is not, and he must not be allowed to become such and similar. Note here that the *existence* of the opposing foe also is an organic part of the one, without which the latter would not realise its own existence, (on the general principle that everything carries its opposite within itself.)

R ā g a, love, on the other hand, is the Self Itself. Hence, indeed, it is not named expressly in the aphorism, side by side with i c h c h h ā, ḍ v e ṣ h a, etc.[1] The form of r ā g a is this: As I am, so is this self. Why and how should there

---

[1] It may be asked why r ā g a and ḍ v e ṣ h a are not regarded here as the two sub-divisions of i c h c h h ā, why the whole of i c h c h h ā is put beside a part of itself *viz.*, ḍ v e ṣ h a; and why p r a y a ṭ n a and j ñ ā n a are not also stated in pairs like pleasure and pain. The *Nyāya* aphorism quoted in the text is current in the extant *Nyāya-Sūṭra* also. Difference of standpoint and immediate purpose would probably be the explanation. In pairs, we would have pleasure and pain, knowledge and error, love and hate, action and re-action, (for activity and laziness, p r a y a ṭ n a and s h ā i ṭ h i l y a.) The matter is discussed in the text itself later.

be any difference of onewise and otherwise? As I am, so is this whole world. All are similar, all are equal, and all are verily the same. There is no difference, no opposition anywhere, no separateness of any kind. The One Self is present in all. How shall this one suffer pain, when I am happy? How may he become painless and happy also?

This rāga is the source of sympathy and sorrow for others who may be in a condition worse than our own; of joy for others in a condition equally good with ours. Sneha, prīṭi, prema, etc., are all variations of it.[1] It becomes ḍayā, compassion, pity, towards those to whom we are shreṣhtha, superior. Looking with the eye of rāga, the jīva thinks: Alas! how is it that this one is laghu, inferior to me, smaller than I am, though he is a living being like me? He is wanting in such and such things; I have got them; let me give these to him, so that he may become equal to me. When in that particular mood of rāga which is called

[1] Current use of these Samskṛṭ words is not sufficiently discriminate to make one feel sure about English equivalents. The text gives its own interpretations of some of these words later on. As to the most important forms of rāga—to superiors, to equals, to inferiors, see *Yoga-Sūṭra*, I. 33; *Viṣhṇu-Bhāgavaṭa*, IV. viii. 34; and *The Science of the Emotions*.

ḍ a y ā, benevolence or pity, the j ī v a thinks particularly of the condition of his inferiors, of the causes of their inferiority, of their consequent unhappiness, and of the means of remedying these. Such compassion asks: How are you? Why so sad? What can I do to help you? Is not the Self the same in us both? You are I and I am you. Tell me all your troubles. I will do all I can to remove it, etc.

The reason underlying the invitation and gathering together of relatives and friends on all occasions of s a m s k ā r a s, sacraments and ceremonies, occasions of joy and sorrow, is this same, *viz.*, that they may be able to help each other and fulfil one another's needs and realise the Common Self in more than usual measure. Why only relatives and friends? Because, though, truly, all have the right to demand and receive help from all, yet, for practical purposes, within the regions of the limited, it is not possible for all to gather in a limited space and time, and therefore convention restricts such gatherings to friends and relatives, etc. Because the Self is one in all, therefore one I calls upon or invites another. That there is one I and another I is due to the manyness of the sheaths. Because of this is it possible for one I to learn of, and fulfil, the needs of another I. Only the I can

know of the wants of the I. This is the reason of the grieving of the elder over the loss by death or otherwise of a younger. He thinks, on the one hand, from the standpoint of the world: The lost one was younger than I; he was my relative; he would have carried on my work, etc. On the other hand, he feels, from the standpoint of the Self: It was my duty to educate him, to bring him up to my own level; I have failed herein, etc. The cause of joy at the birth or marriage of a younger is similar: He will carry on my work of the multiplication of the one into the many (the work of self-expansion which is the essence of joy); he will make new brahmāṇdas. The One Universal Necessity alone appears in all the endless forms of the particular needs and wishes, the prayojana, the moving, inducing, compelling purpose, of all these particular circumstances. It is called by the name of prayojana when delimited by time. From such a point of time to such another, such a one can help on the prayojana of such another one.

In the preceding paragraphs we have observed the workings of rāga. We see, on the other hand, that it also happens that when one is pleased another is pained by that fact, and, *vice versā*, when one is pained another is pleased

thereby. Why is this? When a jīva regards himself as exclusive of or separate from others, when the element of manyness is prominent and the oppositions that are born in the many out of the many from the very fact and multiplication of the manyness—then such is the necessary consequence. Then one jīva suffers pain at another's gain: Why has this one obtained this thing that I have not gained? This feeling of pain may occur even when the person (feeling it) feels himself superior to the other with the self-complacence of jealousy. A common instance is the case of marriage where the parents of the bride sadden to lose their daughter and the parents of the bridegroom rejoice to gain a daughter-in-law.

Such regrets and sorrows (and joys, etc.) are to be recognised as facts, and regarded as more or less justifiable, only as temporary moods in and of the limited. Otherwise, from the standpoint of the transcendental, there is no room for such. And (even for practical purposes) as the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: Prayaṭna or effort, exertion, one's best endeavor, is the (only proper) function of the individual jīva. Action should be undertaken without consideration of consequences (*i.e.*, whether they will be pleasurable or painful to the actor; it is enough that he exerts

his utmost to discharge his duty). The counsel that consequences should be carefully pondered before action is undertaken, refers to the limitations in time, from the standpoint of the 'bound,' *i.e.*, the jīvas not yet 'liberated'.[1]

---

[1] In other words, consequences to others who are not 'liberated' but are on the Path of Pursuit and are moved by motives of worldly pleasures and pains, should be carefully considered by those who, having passed on to the Path of Renunciation, no longer care for consequences to themselves.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XXX.

THE ENDLESS MOODS OF THE OPPOSITES, LOVE AND HATE.

Three main sub-divisions of love.—Of hate.—Superiority, equality, inferiority.—Different names of the triplet for the two sides, of love and of hate.—Correspondences with A, U and M.—Why the 'marks' of the Self are spoken of as six, rather than three.—Metaphysical transcendence, by the the Self, of all marks.

The nature and origin of the special emotions may be considered here, to illustrate one psychological aspect of the endless moods of the pair of opposites.

Under rāga, we note that when one jīva feels with regard to another, 'this other I is greater than I, I am smaller than he, he can supply my wants'—then the relationship with this other I that is formed in the mind of the īva is the emotion of sneha, affectionate respect, reverence. In this condition of sneha, the jīva thinks or feels: 'I am in this condition; thou (the other jīva) hast attained that higher one'; and it desires to arrive at that higher condition also, and, by reason of the Unity

of the I, places itself there. Such is the form or nature of sneha.

The modifications, kinds, grades or sub-divisions of sneha are many: āḍara, respect, veneration; pūjā, worship, adoration; praṭiṣhṭhā, honor, 'high-placing,' giving precedence. The arising or arousing of joy within oneself at sight of some one greater, under the conviction that by securing him (for friend) his status would be attained also, and consequent salutation of him, *i.e.*, the communication to him of one's needs and inferiority in every way—such is the nature of āḍara, reverence. But be it remembered that it is always joyous. Pūjā, worship, is the carrying out of his orders, doing his work; that is to say, acquiring gradually the necessary fitness for his position or status.[1] It is the serving of him in every possible and proper way to show and realise unity

[1] In daily life, apprentices gradually become masters; private secretaries, chiefs; ministers, heads; etc. The *Rāma Pūrva Ṭāpinī Upaniṣhaṭ*, iv., explains that in the various manṭras sacred to various ḍevaṭās, which are prescribed for japa, repetition, the significance of the namah, salutation, is that of mental effort at identification. The *Rāma Ṭāpinī Uṭṭara* says the word, implying utter self-surrender, stands for highest bliss of mergence and identity.

with him even under separateness. Praṭiṣhṭhā, honoring, high-placing, is the conveying, making known, prajñāpana, to one's inferior of one's (wish to bring him up to his) own greater or superior condition.[1] Saṭkāra is all this generally; it is 'good-making,' good manners, good behavior, good treatment. The karaṇa, doing, of that which is saṭ, good, true, right, proper—that is, saṭkāra. To know the unity of all, and to endeavor to realise it by trying to teach and help and uplift all—this is true saṭkāra. Towards the greater, it takes the form of reverence. They are pleased thereby.

Towards the smaller, it becomes compassion, already touched upon in the preceding chapter.

When there is similarity or equality, between jīva and jīva, there arises prīṭi, affection, between them. Maiṭrī, friendship, depends upon equality only. Those

[1] The use of the word 'honor' in English is similar with that of praṭiṣhṭhā in Samskṛṭ, *i.e.*, double-sided. An inferior is 'honored' by a superior, as when a sovereign honors a good public servant with a title, etc. A superior is 'honored' by an inferior, as when children honor their parents. The underlying idea is the recognition of high merit.

whose vyasana, addictions, habits, tastes, amusements, interests, occupations, are the same, and who are the same, similar, or equal, in buḍḍhi and manas, intelligence and activities—between such arises mutual friendship, bringing the highest pleasure to both. Prīṭi has two forms, gauṇā and bhauṭikī. The friendship that arises between a few, out of consonance of guṇas, qualities, characteristics, ways and habits—that is gauṇā, quality-born, (also, secondary). Universal friendliness and good-will for all bhūṭas, all beings, is bhauṭikī prīṭi, born of the feeling that all are but the One Self. This is uḍāra-chāriṭryam, high-minded beneficence, noble conduct; this is māhāṭmya, great-souledness, magnanimity, which regards the whole world as a single brotherhood, bhrāṭṛṭvena, and, deeper still, as One Self. He to whom the world has thus grown I, who has realised universal brotherhood, sarva-bhrāṭṛ-bhāva, he is the sāḍhu, the good man, the paṇḍiṭa, the conscientious and wise and learned man, the mahāṭmā, of great soul, the mahā-vṛṭṭi, of great deeds, he is the ṛṣhi and the mahā-ṛṣhi, who has 'found' Brahman.

So far the moods of love.

On the other side, where vṛṭṭis, psychoses, moods of mind, temperaments, do not agree, are not samāna or similar, there arises vaira, enmity, instead of friendship. 'He is not like me. He cannot satisfy my requirements. What have I got to do with him?' Such is its form or nature as between equals, sāmya-vaira. Many are its grades, kinds, sub-divisions.

When one jīva endeavors insistently to reduce another to his own ways or views and the other does not accept these, then kalaha or dispute, bickering, altercation, arises. 'I have said this and done this. You have not listened to me and not done as I did.' Such insistence and obstinacy, hāthya, is the essence of kalaha. It may appear that disputes arise sometimes without any such prayāsa, deliberate effort or stubbornness. But, on careful analysis, it will always be found that they are based on the necessity, the constitutional needs, of the parties concerned, and these imply 'ruling passions,' 'character,' stubbornness. In consequence of the supremacy of the Self, each individual self or jīva (on the pravṛṭṭi-mārga, whereon separateness is predominant) feels that (its own work or way of

thinking is the only fit and proper one and that) the work or way of any other I is irrelevant, improper, inopportune. And accordingly it endeavors to teach the other I the right way, even at cost of pain, quite instinctively, or even, (when advanced to the stage of some degree of thoughtfulness) under the conviction that he is doing his duty thereby. This is the obstinacy above-mentioned. This should not be understood to imply that disagreements arise exclusively out of the endeavor of one jīva to *prevent* another, vāraṇa, from doing some thing. Other causes, apaharaṇa or deprivation, etc., are all included herein. It is true that, strictly, no I can take away from another I all Eṭaṭ whatsoever, for I and 'This' are inseparable, or even any particular eṭaṭ that an I has for the time being identified fully with itself; yet it is also true, at the same time, that each I thinks that it is the only I and the sole holder and proprietor of the right and title to possess anything and everything.

As sāmya or equality gives rise to one class of vaira or enmity, so mahaṭva and laghuṭva, greatness or superiority and smallness or inferiority, give rise to other

kinds, just as on the side of rāga or love. In connexion with the sub-divisions of hate however it is customary to use the words prābalya, ḍaurbalya and ābalya,[1] instead of mahaṭva, laghuṭva and sāmya. Prabala means stronger (while mahaṭ means greater); ḍurbala, weaker (as compared with laghu, smaller), and abala, strengthless (as compared with sama, equal)[2]. A question might occur here. We sometimes see, in the world, that the smaller or lower is the stronger? The fact in such cases is that with reference to the special circumstances involved, he is really not the smaller at all but the greater. It may be that a man says to himself: 'I am the greater and this other is the smaller in the eyes of all; that he behaves as high and mighty is only due to my patient endurance of him,' etc. But the fact is that the 'all' whose opinion is here referred to are only those who are in the same condition as and in sympathy with the speaker. The 'all' who are in the

---

[1] This word is not current at the present day.

[2] Even in English the two sets of terms have two distinct associations; the one, of a tender comparison, within the family, so to say, for purposes of adjusting mutual help; the other, of an aggressive measurement of forces, for purposes of mutual harm or hindrance.

position of the other party think otherwise. And the truth is that whosoever can supply any want of another—he is, *in that respect*, stronger or greater than that other. And this is but natural and quite right; for, from the universal standpoint, nothing and no one is inherently greater or stronger than another; all are equally dependent on all; no one can live out his life and do his work independently of all others. The distinctions of higher, lower and level, or superior, inferior and equal, etc., are all appurtenant only to the realm of the limited—though to it they attach inseparably—and there they are based on the particular needs of particular individuals in particular times and places.

Māna, self-confidence, self-respect, dignity, pride, goes with greatness. It presents a dual aspect. On the side of love it takes this form: 'How shall this other and weaker, who is as much the Self as I, and is dependent on me, suffer under my very eyes? I *shall* remove his trouble, whatever the cost may be to myself.' This excellent or righteous pride is a great force for the service of the world, in its successive expansions from pride in one's own individual self to

pride in the country, pride in the race, etc., and, finally, pride in all beings.[1] Such pride is desirable and indeed necessary. Without it the work of the world would not proceed. On the side of ḍ v e ṣ h a, this pride becomes g a r v a which says: 'The small is the small always; the great is always the great. I am I only. (I am self-sufficient, and none else is like me). What need have I of any other, small or great?' It is true that such a person too has needs which have to be supplied, and for the fulfilment of them he bends and stoops before the smallest of the small, but he does so always with the spirit of hostility and opposition at his heart (never realising the full and real significance of the fact; always obsessed with the overpowering sense of his own greatness; cursing inwardly and condemning and contemning with bitterness at heart even when compelled to show humility outwardly, and so keeping up a false sense of his own greatness). Such an one, as soon as his need is fulfilled at once lightly goes back to his previous mood, shallow and unenlightened as ever. He has no knowledge of the Self, but only of his e ṭ a ṭ, the 'this,' the sheath,

[1] These various sub-divisions may, from one standpoint be characterised in terms of s a ṭ ṭ v a, r a j a s and ṭ a m a s.

as the Self. And through and in that sheath, he blindly believes himself to be the actor, enjoyer, ruler of all, and separate from and above all. His one attitude of hostility towards all weaker than himself is: 'How dare you do this! You are not worthy of it! Do not try to rival or imitate me!' etc.

Bhaya, fear, is another form of ḍvesha and vaira, hate and enmity. To believe and feel oneself weaker than the prati-vāḍī, the rival or opponent, is to fear. As the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: Ignorance of āṇṭarya, similarity or equality, is the mark of fear. This ignorance is inevitable where the sense of manyness prevails. The *Brahma-Sūṭra*, indeed, defines ḍveṣha, which is the root of all these, fear, etc., as anān-ṭaryam, dissimilarity. Fear, etc., originate from it, as a general fact. Hence the saying: The weak are full of fear, bha-yārṭa. Sometimes fear arises even without the presence of a definite enemy, at the mere prospect of some work or task only, about the details of which we are ignorant. But here also the opposition is present. This opposition exists between our own present condition (of inclination, energy,

knowledge, etc.), and the condition needed for the work. And when we feel the former to be the weaker then we feel fear. Hence fear has been defined also as the opposition of conditions, from the standpoint of v i r ā g a, (absence of inclination, when the mind shrinks from and fears to take up the burdens of the world).

K r o ḍ h a, anger, is another form of ḍ v e ṣ h a. When a j ī v a, feeling exclusively the importance of his own individual self, wishes to overleap the due order of events, and to express his own c h i ṭ ṭ a, mind, too quickly and unsuccessfully—the mood of mind that results is anger. 'How is it thus and not thus as I desired it to be? Why has not this person acted as I told him to, though he is subordinate to me?' and so forth. When a similar condition arises in the weaker, it is called a v a-k r o ḍ h a, resentment, malice, heart-burning, 'How has he spoken thus to me? Why has he treated me like this?'—is the thought in the mind of the man, but he dare not express it because of the superior strength of the other. It remains a m ā n a s a-k r o ḍ h a, mental anger, only.

When a part, an aspect, of this (emotion of a v a-k r o ḍ h a) appears in one who (otherwise)

is great and strong, it is called ḍroha, hatred. Such ḍroha always endeavors to mar the success of others, whether greater or smaller and with or without (apparent) prayojana, motive, reason. As regards the greater it works thus: 'How may this one be reduced to my condition or a lower one even.' As regards the smaller: 'Let me take steps to make sure that he shall never come up to my condition.' The essence of ḍroha is the entire inability of the jīva to conceive even for a moment the separability of his I from his 'this' or body.

For purposes of correspondence, anger may be assigned to A, fear to M, hatred to U, and pride to the summation. Hatred is the root of all these; the root of that is a-jñāna, ignorance; the root of that again, is the covering up and distortion (āvaraṇa and vikṣhepa) of true knowledge by desire (for identification with a 'this'); for knowledge seated in or founded on desire, personal selfishness, is ḍvesha. From the empirical standpoint of the world, the defeat of a personal need, necessity or desire, with which the individual self is specially identified and in a manner which is exclusive of and hostile to other individual selves and their

needs—is the immediate cause of anger.[1]

The corresponding triplet and summation on the other side are, compassion, reverence, friendliness and p r e m a or love generally.

It may be questioned why these emotions should be aroused in us at the sight of the actions, etc., of even those with whom we are not related in any way. It should be ever remembered that the basic principle always is the unity of all selves and the manyness of the sheaths, and that we are revolted by and feel disgust, g h ṛ ṇ ā, (which also means 'pity') by whatever we do not feel our unity with, whatever is not in assonance with our nature; and are, conversely, rejoiced and gladdened by what is like ourselves.

The ethical inference from all the above, to the metaphysical view, is that both r ā g a and ḍ v e ṣ h a should be abandoned and duty done for duty's sake.

Taking the two great classes of emotions as wholes, we may say that rāga or love corresponds to A, ḍveṣha or hate to U, and what is different from both, indifference, impartiality, equability, justice, to M.

In the above we have seen how action is connected with desire through its two primary forms of love and hate. The manifestation

---

[1] See *The Science of the Emotions*, (2nd Ed.) p. 32.

of desire is only in and by means of action. It arises out of cognition and in turn gives birth to action. We may now proceed to observe that love and hate arise out of and follow upon each other in an endless rotation. In terms of the Logion, they are 'I-Not-This' and 'This-Not-I'.[1] Yet again, 'I-This-thus' is the expression of rāga; also 'This-I-thus'. In these latter, the Negation does not occur, although it occurs in the middle in 'I-Not-This'. The explanation is that Negation has two implications or kinds of meaning: (i) distinction with contradiction, and (ii) distinction with similarity. Thus 'non-human' may mean (i) not man but something like man, as animal, or it may mean (ii) something entirely different from man, as (almost impersonal) god or (almost) inanimate stone. Here, in the second definition of rāga, the significance of distinction with similarity is the one conveyed, and it is covered by the 'thus'. On the other hand, in the definition of ḍvesha, as

[1] The absence of verbs and marks of emphasis makes it nearly impossible to assign a precise unmistakable and relevant meaning to each one of these permutations; but the context may help us to make more or less approximate guesses. Thus 'I-Not-This' may mean '*I*, and not This,' *i.e.*, 'let the common I prevail and not the separating This,' and so on.

'I-thus-Not-This,' or This-Not-I, the other significance, of distinction with contradiction, is the one that is to the fore. (Briefly, the same words, the same S v a-b h ā v a, includes both aspects inseparably. Emphasise one, we have hate. Emphasise the other, we have love.[1] If hate succeeded in abolishing the 'other' entirely, then itself would perish too for lack of nourishment to live upon. If love identified itself with the other wholly, itself would be lost for lack of body to nourish).

We have just said that love and hate are the two primary forms of desire. For this reason and allied considerations as regards the other factors, it might be urged that it would have been enough to say that 'the marks of the Self are wish, effort and knowledge, i c h c h h ā, p r a y a ṭ n a, j ñ ā n a, in other words, the old familiar desire, action and cognition. Why speak of 'desire, aversion, effort, (or volition or conation or exertion), pleasure, pain and cognition,' as the marks? The reply is, because the six constitute the two subdivisions of each of the main three. Thus aversion is the p a r i v a r ṭ a n a, opposite, of desire; pleasure, of action; and pain, of cognition. But ḍ v e ṣ h a is the opposite of r ā g a, and not of

---

[1] See the *Viṣhṇu-Bhāgavaṭa*, VIII. xix. 38, 39, 40; and *The Science of the Emotions*, 2nd Eḍ., pp. 57, 58.

ichchhā, of which it is only a sub-division and not a contradiction; and so too as regards the others; why then have not the proper pairs of sub-divisions been mentioned, instead of the main three factors and one sub-division of each (and that too doubtful in the case of two, *viz.*, pleasure as a sub-division of action and pain as one of cognition)? Because it was obviously, absolutely and primarily necessary to mention the three main factors, and only secondarily to speak of any sub-divisions at all, and just to indicate that these sub-divisions and multiplications were in reality endless.[1] The unity of desire is love, hence

---

[1] This argument may not appear quite convincing at first sight, and what follows may also strike the reader as somewhat far-fetched. But if we translate the author's idea into slightly different language, this may appeal more effectively to us, thus: "To point out the presence of the primal trinity everywhere is the main purpose of this work; to indicate the endless other minor triplets arising out of it, a secondary purpose." As said in an early footnote, sometimes startling substitutions are made by the author, in a normal scheme of triplets, by borrowing 'corresponding terms' from other schemes of triplets, apparently to stimulate the reader's mind. Three triplets seem to be amalgamated here, each corresponding to A U M, respectively,

the mention of desire mentions it. The endlessness of modifications that flows from its opposition, contradiction, disruption into many —that is indicated by the mention of aversion. It is the same as regards exertion and pleasure. It may be said that there is never any pleasure in action, but only labor and trouble, and so pleasure cannot be one of any pair of sub-divisions of action; but this is not so, for it is only by action that the manifestation of anything and everything can take place and, in a sense (*viz.*, that of play and pastime as opposed to work) all such manifestation is pleasurable too. So, again, while the unity of cognition (*viz.*, that continuous cognition is one characteristic of Ā ṭ m ā) is sufficiently covered by the mention of cognition, its endlessness of sub-divisions is indicated by the word 'pain'. Here too, at first sight it appears that only in knowledge is all joy, and all alleviation and abolition of pain; but there is the fact, on the other hand, that the experiencing of opposition, manyness, separateness, is the experiencing of pain; and experiencing is knowing; therefore, knowledge includes pain also. Thus, then, are all these above-mentioned six, properly mentioned

---

as a whole and also in its factors, *viz.*, cognition, action (effort), desire; impartiality, aversion, attraction; pleasure, pain, peace.

as the marks of the Ā ṭ m ā. As the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: The marks of the Self arise out of definiteness and indefiniteness. Or as the *Sāṅkhya:* All knowledge is the mark of the Self. Or as the *Mīmāmsā:* Action only is the characteristic of the Self. (Each here, of course, is speaking from a different standpoint).[1]

The *Brahma-Sūṭra* also says: The v i v a r-ḍ h a n a, growth, increase, intensification or expansion of the Self, Ā ṭ m ā, is pleasure; and the p r a ṭ i v a r ḍ h a n a, the decrease, diminution, contraction or decay of it is pain. This may be explained one way, thus, *viz.*, growth or evolution is k r i y ā or action, and that is pleasure. On the other hand, the result of j ñ ā n a, true knowledge, is the beholding of the existence of Unity and the non-existence of separateness; it is the

[1] The way in which alliances exist between the most distant and even opposite-seeming ideas, and how the mind passes from one thought to another, that everything is related to everything, and no precise, razor-cut, hard and fast and final definition of anything whatsoever is possible —all this must have become abundantly clear to the reader of this work already. The context is but further illustration of this. It may be useful to compare the English expressions, 'knowledge is power' and 'ignorance is bliss,' ''tis folly to be wise,' 'a sadder and a wiser man'. It is all a matter of difference of standpoint.

reduction of multiplicity to unity; and this is the result of decrease or involution, growth in the opposite direction, which decrease is pain; hence also the converse statement that pain is born of knowledge, sadness of wisdom (and *vice versa*, for, as fully discussed elsewhere, wisdom is born of reflexion, and reflexion is aroused only by pain). (This, of course, from one standpoint. From another, true knowledge is the highest happiness because it is the expansion of the small self into identity with the Infinite Self; while action might be said to be painful because it is, perforce, a contraction of the All-Consciousness into dealings with and in the limited).

In reality however,

The Self has no mark, but is Its own mark,
It has no sense of pleasure or of pain,
It has no strenuousness and strife in It,
Nor fear of effort and slow indolence;
No knowledge, true or false, belongs to It,
No lust of hate, no ecstasy of love,
No friendships and no enmities It feels;
Compassion, sympathy, benevolence,
Affection sweet and reverence and faith
Are all unknown to it as much as wrath
And rage and anger, pride and scorn and fear;
It never breaketh, never maketh peace,

But ever standeth pure Self-centredness,
Unbound, unfreed, blissful and Self-complete.
Yet, for the Self is seen in many selves,
Give us, Ye Gods! the love that clasps all beings,
That willingly, yea eagerly, serves all,
Ever endeavoring to bring joy to each.
No greater service is than this all-service,
No duty greater and no sacrifice;
It is the sorest ṭapas, self-denial,
It is the greatest ḍāna, charity,
It is the one sole fount of deepest knowledge,
To serve all is to serve oneself, the Self.
One's own, one's special, duty is Self-duty,
And this Self-duty is true Selfishness,
For only Svārṭha, Selfishness, prevails,
Parārṭha, altruism, and Paramārṭha
Pure duty, both are naught, both lost therein.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XXXI.

TRIPLETS.

I-This-Not.—Praṭyagāṭmā-Jīvāṭmā-Ḍaivī-prakṛṭi.—Saṭ-chiḍ-ānanḍa, and its sub-divisions.—Manas-buḍḍhi-ahaṅkāra.—Sensation, perception, imagination; apprehension, comprehension, ambition; position, composition, supposition.—Expansion of the small into the Great Self.—Relation of subtle and gross between primary and secondary, radical and derivative, triplets.—Saṭṭva-rajas-ṭamas.—Ḍravya-guṇa-karma.—Twelve factors included in four triplets, corresponding with twelve logia.—Correspondences and reflexions.

All the siḍḍhānṭas, established conclusions, perfected ends, final or ultimate facts of the World-process, have been outlined in the foregoing chapter under the aspect of marks, liṅga, characteristics, qualities of the Self. As the *Nyāya* points out, a siḍḍhānṭa is ascertained by means of a ḍṛṣhṭānṭa, illustration, analogy, instance, example; and an analogy is that wherein the minds of the expert and the commoner are analogous, that is, co-incide and agree. The outward, plain, familiar and unmistakable facts of the world

afford such analogies. And by means of them we have established the triune nature of Brahman. This tri-unity or triplicity appears everywhere, and all the world may be 're-sumed,' summed up, in such triplets. Thus:

The primal trinity is of course I, This and Not. Next in order of importance are four triads: Jīvāṭmā, Praṭyagāṭmā and Ḍaivī-prakṛṭi,[1] make one triplet. In Praṭyagāṭmā, again, we find the important triplet of saṭ, chiṭ and ānanḍa. Here saṭ, corresponding to kriyā, is mentioned first, because as the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: From the point of view of Praṭyagāṭmā, kriyā appears (first). The general rule of course holds good, that cognition occurs first, and then desire and then action. But the point here is that cognition and desire are, so to say, *within* Praṭyagāṭmā, and the readiness, the endeavor, to act in accordance with them, *appears outside*, as it were. Again, because on and by action being performed,

[1] Apparently, for some special reason, the word jīvāṭmā, the individualised or materialised self —capable of and possessing plurality, whereas the word Praṭyagāṭmā is always only singular and is never to be met with in the plural—has been substituted for Mūla-prakṛṭi.

new knowledge is gained (as *e.g.*, by going to a new country), therefore c h i ṭ is mentioned next after s a ṭ. After c h i ṭ, comes ā n a n ḍ a. Then again s a ṭ, then c h i ṭ, then ā n a n ḍ a, and so on endlessly. In terms of the Logion, we may say that when the s a ṭ-ṭ ā, being, of the I is in or is reflected in the This, then the e ṭ a ṭ has or is or becomes s a ṭ, existent or existence; and conversely, when the s a ṭ-ṭ ā, existence or pseudo-being, of the This is reflected in the I, then the p r a y o g a, the projection, combination, employment, of the two s a ṭ-ṭ ā-s is c h i ṭ; [1] and, finally, 'Not-I, Not-This,' 'This-Not-I,' 'Not-This, Not-I' is the experience of ā n a n ḍ a, that is to say, in ā n a n ḍ a, the being of This and the being of I are both gathered up and projected into the Not, and conflict and opposition and even trace of difference cease, and the Not permeates the I and the This and appears as infinite (un-conscious) bliss (*oblivious* of all particulars).

Changes of order in this triplet occur here or in other world-systems in reference to other triplets. And within each of these three the primal triplet is repeated over and over again. Thus in A h a m, 'a' means the immortal, 'h a' the mortal, and 'm' that which is other than both.

---

[1] See *The Science of Peace*, p. 265.

So, too, e, ṭa, and ṭ, respectively in e ṭ a ṭ. So s a ṭ breaks up into s, a, ṭ; c h i ṭ into c h, i, ṭ; ā n a n ḍ a, into ā, n a n, ḍ a, similarly.[1]

This triplet of s a ṭ, c h i ṭ and ā n a n ḍ a reappears transformed as the triplet of m a n a s of the nature of k r i y ā, b u ḍ ḍ h i of the nature of c h i ṭ, and a h a ṅ k ā r a of the nature of ā n a n ḍ a and desire.[2] These three, m a n a s, etc., exist and operate in every atom, but they are illustrated most fully in humans, amongst whom we find the capacity for apprehending universals. The functions of the three may be described as below.

All appearance of separateness is, or is the work of, m a n a s.[3] M a n a s cognises by means

---

[1] See Vol. I, pp. 119, 120, *supra* and compare *Chhāndogya*, VIII. iii. 5 and *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* V. v. i. for a similar analysis of s a ṭ y a m. There is much more in the text here of a similar nature, but is not translatable in any useful and effective manner. What is given is only by way of sample. The original text would be full of suggestion to those acquainted with Samskṛṭ.

[2] See Ch. xxvii, *supra*. Sometimes, from another point of view, a h a ṅ k ā r a is said to correspond with k r i y ā, as I-*making*, self-assertive, and then m a n a s is regarded as a phase of i c h c h ā.

[3] Intellectually, as discrimination, distinction, analysis; ethically as egoism, selfishness; practically as individualistic activity, self-assertion, aggression, etc.

of the proximity or contact of the senses and their objects (with each other, and of the manas or mind with one sense at a time). As the *Nyāya* says: The non-occurrence of yugapaṭ-jñāna, simultaneous cognition, is the mark of manas.[1] (That is to say, the fact that we cannot cognise more than one thing, or receive or perceive more than one, or one kind of, sensation clearly at a time, is due to manas). Here yuga-paṭ means '(two) as if one,' 'as one'. This 'as-one-ness' is a universal fact and unity ought and has to be known, learnt, cognised, realised. But because many-ness arises out of unity, the result is that all particular knowledge or cognition is dual; it is (*a*) a matter of manyness or separate-ness, which is (*b*) always based on a unity. Now, the non-recognition, the forgetfulness, of the second element, the basis in unity, and the exclusive and excessive recognition of the first element, that of manyness and separate-ness—this is the characteristic mark, the differ-entiating proprium, the result of the operation, of manas. Saṅkalpa and vikalpa, 'resolu-tion and doubt' or alternative vacillation, ap-pear in the manas only. As the *Brahma-Sūṭra*

[1] *Nyāya-Sūṭra*, I. i. 16. *Cf.* the modern psycho-logist's 'retinal yellow spot' and 'the hot point of consciousness'.

says: Separateness appears or is realised only by means of these two, *viz.*, saṅkalpa and vikalpa. Also: The mark of the lower mind is the recognition of separateness and the absence of unified and unifying knowledge. The *Mīmāmsā* also says: The non-recognition of unity is manas. For such reasons, the recognition or accentuation of separation being the function of manas, and the manifestation of manyness, multiplication, being the main business of kriyā, and, yet again, kriyā being the result of vikalpa and saṅkalpa, we may well conclude that the nature of manas is kriyā. The non-separateness, unity, connexion, relation or interdependence that appears in and through all-separateness—that is the work of buḍḍhi, (the reason or higher mind which *ratio*-cinates, sees relations, while the understanding or lower mind sees single facts only). That by which *all* is *com*-prehended is buḍḍhi. Boḍhana, comprehension, is essentially the seeing of the many as linked together by a unity. For this reason the *Nyāya* declares: The birth of yugapaṭ-jñāna, simultaneous cognition, is the mark of buḍḍhi.[1] Yugapaṭ-jñāna, means knowledge of two's, many's, as pairs, as

[1] Not current. *Cf.* 'Field of vision,' 'fringe of thought,' 'continuum of consciousness'.

one, as unified. And the *Brahma-Sūṭra* declares: Non-separateness is recognised by means of buḍḍhi. It is true the *Mīmāmsā* says: Buḍḍhi is bahu-varṭinī, many-dwelling, residing in the many; but this statement refers to the operations of buḍḍhi in conjunction with manas, (that is to say, it means that manas cognises the many, and buḍḍhi also undoubtedly dwells amid that many, but it does so as a unifying and organising thread).[1] Out of the conjunction of one and many, buḍḍhi and manas, arises the appearance, manifestation or recognition, of one in many and many in one.

Aham-kāra is of the nature of desire and bliss. It is only when a jīva believes or regards himself as a 'substantial' something, that desire becomes possible. I am so and so and have arrived at this condition by having done this and this; such is my present position, status, dignity, and I have to achieve so much more; when I have secured it I shall become so and so; then I will attain so much more, etc.—all this endless architecture of desire is based on or is ahamkāra. And ānanḍa, bliss, happiness, pleasure, is present herein alone. For the essence of supreme

[1] Compare the theosophical views as to the buḍḍhic web of life.

bliss is the uttermost conviction, and nothing else, that 'I alone am or is all,' that there is naught above or below, before or after, behind or beyond I or me. While there is the feeling that there is any such other anywhere, so long there is the feeling of absence of finality and stability and indisputable sovereignty and permanence. It is this blissfulness of the Supreme I which, by reflexion, makes the pleasure of the egoism of the individual I also; otherwise, indeed, from the standpoint of the Total Universal, egoistic a h a m-k ā r a is wholly irrelevant and improper and, indeed, is the very cause of bondage, the enslaving of the soul to desire. From the standpoint of worldly expediency also, it is useless to indulge in egoism and egotism, when we see every moment that we are helplessly dependent on others and not self-complete, and are related to them in an endless gradation of higher and lower. For such reason, the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: Let a h a m-k ā r a rise into the generalisation of the S v a m, the Universal Self, out of all selves, and into the performance of the work of that Self. In other words, be not overwhelmed by the mutual relatedness of many selves, and the consequent feeling of dependence, and think not of the personal

results of actions, but think only of the Inner Self and do your due work with the might and desire and knowledge of that Self, with all the best power and the noblest aspiration and the deepest knowledge that you have. And therefore should such knowledge be diligently secured as will indefeasibly establish self-knowledge within the self and give to the jīva that true, free and Unbounded Egoism which will make him always feel the I and only the I that exists ever and everywhere in limitless blissfulness.

In terms of the Logion, 'I-I-I' is ahamkāra; 'I-I-This' is buḍḍhi, or also 'This-This-I,' both being the experience of chiṭ; and 'This-This-This,' or 'This-This-I' also, is saṭ, *i.e.*, manas. Therefore has the svarūpa, form, nature, of manas, been described as 'I-This-I-This-This-This-This-I-I-I'. The experience of buḍḍhi, on the other hand is 'Not-Not-Not-I-This-Not-This-Not-This-Not-This-This-This-Not-I-I-I-alone'. The form of ahamkāra is 'Not-This-This-Not-I-I-I'. (?)[1]

[1] All this cannot be wholly without meaning. The depth and weight of the whole work forbid such a light and superficial assumption. But it is impossible, with the means at our disposal, to fix the significance. May these descriptions

Such, in brief, is the ternary of manas, buḍḍhi and ahamkāra, being the sṭhūla or gross form of that of which the sūkṣhma or subtle form is the ternary of saṭ, chiṭ and ānanḍa. Its sub-divisions and modifications are many with reference to general and special experiences (as may be gathered from the observations recorded in Section II, *supra*). [1]

---

be indicative of the ways of vibration of the āṭma-buḍḍhi-manas atoms, to use theosophical phraseology?

[1] It may not be amiss to attempt here, in a footnote, to compare the statements in the text of manas, etc., with modern *Nyāya*-doctrines. The aphorism quoted in the text as to the mark of manas is to be found exactly in the same words in the current *Nyāya-Sūṭra*. It is explained variously. One set of interpreters understand thereby that two things even when belonging to the same sense, cannot be cognised simultaneously; I am not cognising the seven flowers in the bouquet before me simultaneously, with the sense of vision, but only successively. Another and the larger school hold that the aphorism means only that objects belonging to different senses cannot be cognised simultaneously, *e.g.*, the color and form of flower, its fragrance, and a note of music, can be perceived only in succession. And the reason is, they say, that the manas is an atom and each sense-

The next important triplet is that of M ū l a-prakṛṭi, *viz.*, s a ṭṭ v a, r a j a s, ṭ a m a s.

---

organ proper, i n ḍ r i y a, is also an atom, and cognition arises only when an i n ḍ r i y a-atom contacts an object and is contacted itself, at the same time, by the mind-atom. As to how we are able to talk about armies and hosts and the five sense-organs and make comparisons, etc.—this is explained very elaborately by the assumption of s a m s k ā r a s, impressions, left by each cognition on the mind and so forth. But the result is not satisfactory. The difficulty is only removed one step. Modern *Nyāya* does not own the supplementary aphorism descriptive of the work of b u ḍ ḍ h i which is quoted in the text here. And yet on the general principle that there must be some element of truth in every opinion, the argumentation of even the modern n a y y ā-y i k a, though he has strayed far from his true home, cannot be wholly futile.

The reconciliation may be found in combining the general principles of the metaphysics expounded here with the superphysics to be found in theosophical literature. The one and the many can never be separated. Now the one predominates in consciousness; now the other. And principles are not to be found and held apart from embodiments, as pointed out in an earlier note. While the *Nyāya*, as current now, knows of no intermediaries between the m a n a s (which, to it, is practically the individual soul or j ī v a)

The oneness of all that is, is saṭṭva.[1] The name of (the principle of) parivarṭana,

---

and the āṭmā, the further developments of thought in the other systems make it clear that this manas has three aspects, buḍḍhi, etc., besides a summating fourth or chiṭṭa; and Theosophy enables us to add that in practical embodiment these three aspects become the triple individual āṭmā-buḍḍhi-manas, āṭmā here corresponding with ahaṅ-kāra. This manas-atom is the singularising atom; the buḍḍhi-atom (probably by means of still subtler and smaller super-atoms constituting it) is the many-comprehending one; and the āṭmā-atom would be the unifying, self-referring, organising one giving being to the whole. When, by processes of meditation, etc., the centre and seat of consciousness is shifted upwards and the manas, mind, 'cast off' into the category of sheath, then it develops into a mental body proper, losing its characteristic of singularising; another subtler atom (that which is buḍḍhic to us probably) then takes up the work of manas, the āṭmic or ākāshic that of buḍḍhi, the anupāḍic that of āṭmā, and so on endlessly. The metaphysical principle or scheme of triplicity remains ever the same. Its embodiment is ever differing. Compare the latest Theosophical views as to personality, individuality, Ego, spirit, monad, etc., etc., corresponding with various graded sheaths.

[1] These three are often translated into English

changes, transformations, turns and returns, is rajas. Ṭamas is that which is different from (and binds together) both. As usual, there are endless minor triplets within each of these.

In terms of the Logion: the reflexion of the I in This and This is saṭṭva; of the This in I and I is rajas; of the This in This and This and of the I in I and I is ṭamas.

Finally because the jīvāṭmā is a compound of both Praṭyagāṭmā and Mūlaprakṛṭi, therefore the triplet belonging to each is present therein, in a transmuted form, *viz.*, as jñāna-ichchhā-kriyā of the former, and ḍravya-guṇa-karma of the latter.

---

as rhythm, mobility, and inertia. Strictly speaking these three are the sub-divisions of rajas, rhythm being sāṭṭvika activity, mobility being rājasa activity *i.e.*, activity pure and simple, and inertia being ṭāmasa or persistent activity. The sentence of the text '... oneness ... is saṭṭva' explains how rhythm comes to be sāṭṭvika. For rhythm, on analysis, is seen to be *uniform* repetition. Similar sub-divisions are distinguishable under rajas and ṭamas. The nearest and fullest equivalents for the three in English, seem to be cognisability, mobility, or motility, and substantiality. See *Sāṅkhya-Kārikā*, verse 13, and *The Science of Social Organisation*, p. 53.

These are the four more important triplets comprising twelve factors, corresponding to the twelve Mahā-vākyas or logia. With each factor again, goes its negative aspect, because of the inseparability of the negation, giving another twelve, the net result of the whole being of course always Unity.

The order within each triplet may be considered now, from a new point of view.

To begin with saṭ-chiḍ-ānanḍa. It has been stated before that the reflexion of the I in the This[1] is kriyā (action, saṭ);

---

[1] What was before stated was rather the other way, *viz.*, that the reflexion of the This in the I is kriyā, and an attempt was made in a foot-note there, to reconcile that view with the one put forward in *The Science of Peace*, p. 265, by difference of standpoint. It may be added here that, in modern times, Fichte has put the view that the self becomes aware of an objective world by activity. The element of truth in each view will be easily discovered by any one who dwells on the significance of the Logion. The Universal Self postulates, asserts, assumes, the Not-Self, and so far, gives existence to the Not-Self. We may, therefore, say that the appearance, the reflexion, the picturing of the This in the I, (*by the I*) is Kriyā. But from the standpoint of the small self, the individual I, (independently of its will) this amounts to cognition. Of course, for such cognition too, there must be

and of the I in the Eṭaṭ, which is (or corresponds to) saṭ, is chiṭ (cognition, jñāna); and that the unity, the mutual mergence, of the two, the shining forth of the negation, is ānanḍa (desire, ichchhā). Now this (appearance of distinction where in reality there is none) is the result of the (illusive, superimposed, false) manyness of the I. But if so, then it might be asked why the I, *i.e.*, chiṭ (which corresponds to the Self of the primal Trinity) does not come first. The answer is that the cause or actor is hidden or included in the effect, *i.e.*, action, and hence is *mentioned* after the result, *i.e.*, manyness or action, has been mentioned; that is to say, Aham is mentioned after Eṭaṭ, chiṭ after saṭ. And after the experiencing of the manyness (and the realisation of it as false), there comes again the restoration to the original condition of unity, which is ānanḍa. For pleasure and pain belong only to the condition wherein manyness is felt. Outside that condition is bliss. As the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: Before and after—is

---

attention on the part of the individual, a coming into the position where the object can be reflected in his mind, and so far, again, we may say that the process of reflexion is (or is at least *due* to) action. And so on, round and round.

bliss.[1] That is to say, Bliss surrounds, envelopes, contains within it pleasure and pain.

The second triplet is, similarly, the result of the manyness of the E ṭ a ṭ. Here (from another standpoint it appears that) the manyness of the This arises and appears in and is supported by the I only and is included therein. Hence the I takes precedence and the This follows. 'This in I' is s a ṭ ṭ v a, which comes first; 'This and This in I' is r a j a s which comes next;[2] the Negation combining the two comes last as ṭ a m a s. It might be said that ṭ a m a s, which indicates the connecting i c h c h h ā, should have come immediately after s a ṭ ṭ v a and before r a j a s, so as to be between them, as nexuses come between the factors they link together. But the special order given here is due to the fact that cognition and action on the one hand

---

[1] Compare को ह्येवान्यात् कः प्राण्यात् यद्येष आनन्दो न स्यात् *Taiṭṭirīya Upaniṣhaṭ*, II. vii. 1.

[2] 'This in I' has to be interpreted apparently as meaning 'This as included in the I,' 'I as including and setting its stamp on all This'—in order to reconcile the present text with the statement made shortly before that "the reflexion of the I in This and This is s a ṭ ṭ v a". The present description of r a j a s has to be manipulated similarly to bring it into line with the preceding one.

and action and desire on the other are constantly and inseparably connected together; and the manyness of the Eṭaṭ, which is kriyā on the one hand and Mūlaprakṛṭi on the other—Mūlaprakṛṭi obviously occupying the middle position in the Logion—is the fact kept most prominently in view in this particular reference.[1] Besides, the other possible permutations, saṭṭva-ṭamas-rajas, rajas-saṭṭva-ṭamas, ṭamas-saṭṭva-rajas, etc., are also there, in endless time and motion and countless detail. Here only the universal principles connected with A U M are stated.

As to the other two triplets:

The preceding This in its reflexion in the succeeding I (of the saṭ-chiḍ-ānanḍa, becomes or is) ḍravya, substance. So the

---

[1] All this ringing of changes is to be explained, as said before very often, by change of standpoint, and helps to fill out our understanding of the whole scheme. The order of saṭṭva-rajas-ṭamas is the order of I-This-Not. If we think of the factors to be connected as the two balls of a dumb-bell, then, naturally, the connecting bar has to come between. But if we think of the nexus as a common co-efficient then, as in and algebraical expression, (a+b)c, it may well be place third, or outside the two, as a vinculum, a+b.

preceding I in its reflexion in the succeeding This (of the saṭṭva-rajas-ṭamas, becomes or is) guṇa, attribute or quality. Finally, the preceding Not in its reflexion in the succeeding Not (becomes) karma, movement. It may be asked how it is that these last two Negations do not leave behind only destruction, and how karma can arise out of them. The reply is that I and This are inseparably attached thereto, and hence karma arises, out of the Negations, in the shape of birth, stay and death, and not of death only.

The case of cognition, desire and action is the converse of that of substance, etc. The succeeding This in its reflexion in the preceding I (of saṭṭva-rajas-ṭamas, becomes or is) jñāna, cognition; the succeeding I in its reflexion in the preceding This (of saṭ-chiḍ-ānanḍa becomes or is) kriyā, action; the succeeding Not in the preceding Not is ichchhā, desire. This is why desire stands between cognition and action. That is to say, the Negation that accompanies the succeeding (I), when it enters into the I through the doorway of the This, is reflected in the preceding eṭaṭ, and is finally included in or placed between the This and the I, becomes

manifest as ānanḍa and ichchhā.[1] Hence the scripture-text that "having done all (his work, the jīva) attains happiness, becomes happy".

For practical purposes the triplet of substance-quality-movement is treated as arising first, being the grosser, although (from another standpoint) cognition-desire-action are spoken of as first. But, of course, it should be always borne in mind that these orders and arrangements and successions are only matters of speech and appearance and manifestation. The real co-ordination and underlying simultaneity of mutual relation between and through the triplets is obvious. And a corresponding co-ordination constantly exists between all the countless transformations that arise out of these, the worlds or emanations or evolutions, sṛshtis, of manas, of buḍḍhi, of ahamkāra, of knowledge, of error, of love, of hate, of 'pictures' or reflexions and shadows, of fortuitous and accidental experience, of deliberate achievement, etc.

---

[1] It must be obvious to the reader from the nature of the translation that the text here is exceedingly elusive. Parentheses have been added freely; and yet the determination of the sense must be left largely to the intuition and the industry of the reader. That things become inverted in reflexion, and I and This are opposite and reflecting each other—is a good general clue.

SECTION III. (*Continued.*)

CHAPTER XXXII.

THE TRIPLET OF SUBSTANCE-QUALITY-MOVEMENT.

The reason of this endless prapañcha, 'quintuplicate' ado.—Sva-bhāva.—The inter-dependence of past, present and future in the independence of Sva-bhāva.—Distinction between Sva-bhāva or cause *plus* effect and kāraṇa or cause.—Ḍravya-praḍravya-anuḍravya; karma-prakarma-anukarma; guṇa-praguṇa-anuguṇa.—The pseudo-continuity despite manifest discreteness of ḍravyas, etc.—*Sāṅkhya*-views.—The sub-divisions or kinds of ḍravya dealt with by *Nyāya* and *Vaisheṣhika*.—Division into nine by triplication of triplet.—Precedence and succedence amongst the factors of the triplet.—Significance of the *Nyāya*-word, nigraha-sṭhāna or fallacy.

(The triplet of substance-quality-movement requires to be considered in further detail. But before proceeding to do so we may dispose of some metaphysical questions which may arise in the minds of some readers at this stage).

"But why all these countless transformations at all?" it may be asked. "Why this

prapañcha, this quintuplication and multiplication and complexity and perplexity, this meaningless fuss, this enormous distraction, this aimless wool-gathering, this much ado about nothing? Or, if you say that it *is* there, as a fact, then why not let it rest so; why add to it this argument and counter-argument and endless casuistry and sophistry as to what to do and what to avoid?"[1]

Because this prapañcha is verily Self-established by Its own nature, the Sva-bhāva, the Self-being, of Absolute Brahman, as something which is not, *is* as well as *not*, something of which existence cannot be wholly denied, though neither can it be wholly affirmed; and because, when it has an existence, even though illusory, it is necessary to investigate into the ways of that existence, its methods and its laws. (In other words, as said over and over again, all this multiplicity is included in the Absolute, and enquiry and argument and all the other phases of consciousness are also part of that multiplicity). Things interdependent have a oneness, and

[1] This question will be seen, by the veteran reader, to be a sort of frantic last struggle of the lower mind, the manas-understanding, to escape from the wise control of the higher metaphysical buḍḍhi-reason, into its old vagrancy and puerile wilfulness.

oneness is constitutional, characteristic, essential; it is sva-bhāva; and an (unchanging) unity requires no cause behind it. (A 'why' is possible and proper to ask only when there is a change, an event; only an effect calls forth a why and is explained with a be-cause; where there has been no change, no effect, there no cause, no be-cause, is needed or possible, and no why can even be asked). No Why is needed for the Changeless Whole of the Totality of the World-Process as identical with the Absolute.

It is true that two things interdependent or relative to each other require another, a third something, to relate them, to bind them together, and this chain of another and another and another extends *ad infinitum*, (for the nexus which is intended to cover one junction-point really gives rise to two new junction-points, between the nexus and each of the two factors). But this is so only from the standpoint and in the region of the limited and successive.[1] On the other

---

[1] The student of modern western philosophy might usefully compare this with and use it to rectify and complete Schelling's, Hamilton's, Mansel's and Spencer's doctrine of the Conditioned and the Unconditioned, the Relative and the Absolute. In this statement is also to be found the reason for

hand, this element of *ad infinitum*, this infinity, which gives rise to and runs through and strings together all these endless 'an-others' and includes them all at once, *within* which is all relativity, and which is relative to none, for there is nothing else left outside It to which It could be relative—that is the true Brahman.

Because of this all-comprehensiveness of Brahman is the *Nyāya*-declaration true that the past and the future are equally interdependent. Both are simultaneously parts of the same sva-bhāva which is declared everywhere to be the cause of the world, having no cause of its own. The *Brahma-Sūṭra* declares: Sva-bhāva is independent, does not look to anything else. And the *Nyāya*: It is not 'enveloped,' 'carried,' by any parent; does not depend for its existence on the mediation of any cause. Even in ordinary life, while all things else in the world are related together as cause and effect, turn by turn, sva-bhāva (here, in the sense of individual character, peculiarity, idiosyncracy, which is but an imitation or reflexion of the real 'own-being') is not sought to be connected with anything else as

---

the existence of endless planes within planes of matter. See *The Science of Peace*, p. 56 and 212.

cause (but is, ordinarily, accepted as itself being the final explanation and cause behind which one may not and need not go and which suffices to explain all items of behavior and manifestation in conduct; or, where a cause for that also is sought, there, indeed, it ceases to be regarded as sva-bhāva, and the next explaining circumstance or cause that is reached as final for the time being, is, for that time, regarded as sva-bhāva).[1] In proof of this 'independence' of sva-bhāva, take the case of sleeping, waking, hunger, etc., our 'natural' functions. Do we not feel that sleeping is a waste of valuable time in which new and interesting experiences might be gained! How much more work could we get through if we could only keep awake constantly! So, too, hunger is a most troublesome item in life which we could very gladly do without! Yet, all these

[1] We go on asking 'why did you do this, and this, and this' till the harassed person under cross-examination says 'It was my pleasure,' and then the questioning comes to an abrupt end. The most conclusive explanation of the most extraordinary freaks of behavior is 'it is his nature'. Along the line of search for sva-bhāva behind sva-bhāva, too, we come to the continuum, the all-containing biophorid or monad. *Cf.* discussions ré free-will and motive.

are absolutely necessary, as means of recuperation of our powers—and it seldom strikes us to question their whys and wherefores! In this sense does the *Veḍa* declare that the world is without a cause.

We may distinguish between sva-bhāva and kāraṇa, nature and cause, somewhat in this wise: The totality of necessity is nature, and it is always Self-realised only. A cause, on the other hand, is realised by means of its effect, as, *vice versa*, the effect is realised by its cause.[1]

---

[1] That is to say, from the transcendental standpoint, the Whole is the sum-total of all parts, includes all causes and all effects at once and is the Sva-bhāva; also the same Whole might be 'distinguished' into two aspects, the All-including Consciousness as an Eternal Now, Kūtasṭha, and the ever-flowing procession or anāḍi-ananṭa-pravāha of manifestation, and then the former Whole may be regarded as the Cause of each one of the parts of the latter, which, it should not be forgotten, are arranged in pairs of opposites and whenever and wherever 'summed up' leave behind a Not, by mutual abolition. Again, from the empirical standpoint, applying the above to the limited, we find that the nature of any individual is the sum-total of all the motives and desires that are potential in him, and this totality is

The *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: Out of this Self-becoming arises pseudo-infinity, (non-finality in the World-process). According to the *Sāṅkhya*: That which is independent of all else, is not bound to anything else, which is this, that and everything else indifferently, which can assume all qualities equally—that is the Sva, Self, 'Own,' One. And the Aham, the I, is this Sva. The bhavana, becoming, coming forth into manifestation, of this same I-Own, by its own necessity and existence, is Sva-bhāva.

After so much consideration of the why and wherefore of triplets and the explanation of them all by Sva-bhāva, we may return to the triplets themselves. It has been said that there are endless sub-divisions under each. But the differences and distinctions under cognition-desire-action are subtle and matter for the subtle eye. Moreover, all of them, truth and error, love and hate, action and re-action, are illustrated and defined only by embodiment in or reference to corresponding sub-divisions of the grosser[1]

---

the cause of, or is the same as, all his biography as a whole; but the immediate cause of any one of his acts is some one motive or desire strongest at the time. See *The Science of Peace*, pp. 151—159.

[1] Regarding this 'subtler' and 'grosser' compare the distinction made between viṭarka and vichāra in *Yoga-Sūṭra*, I.

triplet of substance-attribute-movement. And these latter are consequently the more prominent. Their details, ḍ r a v y a, p r a ḍ r a v y a, a n u-ḍ r a v y a, k a r m a, p r a k a r m a, a n u k a r m a, g u ṇ a, p r a g u ṇ a, a n u g u ṇ a, etc., are all expounded in the *Vaisheṣhika*. And the exposition of these expounds the corresponding details of cognition, etc., also. These two triads, with their summation, the World-process, as the seventh, make up the primal septenary.

Ḍ r a v y a has been said before to be of nine kinds (with many grades of density under each), s ū k ṣ h m a or small and subtle, and b ṛ h a ṭ or gross and large, very subtle, very gross, and so on. It might be said that all ḍ r a v y a is i c h c h ā-s h a k ṭ i,[1] energy (self-cohesion and other-resistance) which is necessity, which is a unity. But desire follows or is ever in connexion with cognition and action; hence kinds and sub-divisions arise there also. Being experienced through or by or in them, ḍ r a v y a becomes triple and each of these three again, being sub-divided threefold, yield nine. These may again be sub-divided into twenty-seven and so on endlessly. But nine kinds are generally treated as the more prominent.

It may be said here that ḍ r a v y a does not exist everywhere, s a r v a ṭ r a (because essentially

[1] See *Vishṇu-Bhāgavaṭa*, II. v. 24.

limited, discontinuous, discrete); nor **g u ṇ a**, nor **k a r m a** (for the same reasons, being inseparable from substance). But cognition, desire and action are obviously continuous and universal by virtue of the indisputable universality of the Pra ṭ y a g ā ṭ m ā to which they belong. And because they can never be separated from their objects, substance, etc., therefore these too perforce acquire a pseudo-universality and transcendence or absence of limitation. So that if we insist on the limitedness and consequent absence from any particular space or time of any one triplet of substance, etc., then we have to postulate the presence of some other similar triplet, call it whatever other name we please.[1]

---

[1] In other words, there are vacua within plena and plena within vacua, atoms within atoms, worlds within worlds, planes within planes, ethers within ethers. The Self being a continuous Unity appears as the Continuous Vacuum of space; K h a m-B r a h m a. The Not-Self, being ever a discontinuous manyness appears as particles of substance, 'this, this, this,' substantial atoms. But because every point of space requires a counterfoil-atom of substance, therefore there arises an endless series of ever smaller atoms, with ever smaller intervals of space between them, the excessive smallness of the spatial-interval giving rise to the notion of 'absolute'

Despite the strangeness, the paradoxical character of the process, the limited E ṭ a ṭ, because of invincible association with the unlimited A h a m, becomes also pseudo-unlimited. The 'manifest' existence, a s ṭ i ṭ v a, of the Unlimited, is the Limited, and, *vice versa*, the 'essential' being of the Limited is the Unlimited. Indeed, we see Infinity surging up everywhere in the Finite, and the Finite manifestly arising out of the Infinite. In the ultimate reality, everything is verily infinite, and not possible to describe in terms of the finite alone.

Indeed, one school, that of *Sāṅkhya*, prefers to say that there is neither Limited nor Unlimited, and thereby wins the appellation of n ā s ṭ i k a, non-believing, or, strictly, 'not-is-believing.' It says: 'The truth, the fact, whatever it is, is there before us, before our very eyes, p r a ṭ y a k ṣ h a, directly and immediately sensible and perceptible. The World-process

---

plenitude and rigidity (though always in reality only comparative) from the point of view of a given grosser plane of matter sufficiently distant in grading. It should be borne in mind that no particular, specified, plane of matter can be said to be 'measurably' graded to or from Root-matter, which is always pseudo-abstract and pseudo-infinite; and the infinite can never be attained by any division or multiplication of the finite.

itself is Brahman. This is patent to our very senses. All proofs, all inferences, all arguments, all evidences ultimately base on pratyaksha, direct and immediate sensing, and where we have such direct sensing, what use of other proof? That which people say *is*, is also *not*; and, conversely, what they say is *not*, also *is*. And all this *is* and is *not* is quite obvious, self-evident, so that he who runs may read it on the face of the universe. The This is Not-limited, (limited by the Not, or unlimited), the I is Not-limited, and the Not, merging together, comprehending, dominating both is Not-limited.'

Justifying thus the unlimitedness of the Mūla-prakṛti-triplet and returning to its subdivisions, we note that, according to one view at least, the details of ḍravya ought to be expounded first, inasmuch as it corresponds with desire. Then should follow those of guṇa, attributes, qualities, properties, which depend upon, inhere in, are supported by substance or substratum. Finally come the varieties of karma, movement, motion, which inheres in or is supported by substance and attribute.

These details have been dealt with in the *Nyāya*, as outlined already, under sixteen headings, categories, paḍārṭhas, *viz.*, pra-

m ā ṇ a or proof, etc. Those sixteen also are 'matters of' Self, Not-Self and Negation, it is true, (that is to say, all these sixteen categories can be directly derived by sub-division, from these primary Three, and need not be regarded as subsidiary to the *Vaisheṣhika*-categories); yet, (the practically convenient way of looking at the subject is that) the special specific, one-by-one treatment of ḍ r a v y a, etc., (viewed objectively) is the province of the *Vaisheṣhika* (while the further examination of them, in a subjective aspect, as rearranged in psychological categories, is the work of the *Nyāya*).

On the question of which comes first, substance or attribute or quality, the following observations may be of use. In reality, there is no precedence and no succedence between them. From the s ṭ h ū l a, the dense, physical, external, objective point of view of the world, substance is manifested first, being the substratum, ā s h r a y a, place of inherence, of the others. But from the point of view of the Self, which precedes everything else, and to which g u ṇ a or quality corresponds, the latter, *i.e.*, g u ṇ a, precedes.[1] The case is as with locus and

[1] Herein perhaps may be found the significance of the *Sāṅkhya* view that the ṭ a n m ā ṭ r a s, sound, touch, etc., *i.e.*, the sense-qualities-in-themselves

occupant. To the external view, the locus must precede; to the internal, the occupant. Attributes and substance stand to each other in the position of occupant and locus. All a s ṭ i ṭ v a, is-ness, existence, indispensably requires a locus. Without it the use of the verb 'to be' were impossible. Hence the *Nyāya* statement that 'beatitude is attained by the knowledge of n i g r a h a - s ṭ h ā n a,' 'places of restraint,' barriers, the points at which the opponent in a controversy may be held up, captured, restrained, prevented from proceding further with his argumentation, *i.e.*, the fallacies of 'false or insufficient reason,' 'deliberate deception,' 'non-distribution,' etc.[1] The use of

---

corresponding to the ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s or m a h ā b h u ṭ a s, ā k â s h a, v â y u, etc., precede and give birth to the latter. Modern evolutionists are beginning to say that functions precede organs. Endless rotation is the whole truth.

[1] What appears as the logical 'point for capture' of the 'opponent' in the *Nyāya* becomes the living a ḍ h y ā r o p a of the *Veḍānṭa*, the false superimposition of the attributes of the limited on its external Opponent, the Unlimited Self; it is the great 'fallacy' of self-limitation, the heresy of separateness, the Primal Error which lies at the root of the creation of endless world-systems by Īshvaras as well as the hole-burrowings of the smallest worm.

the word sṭhāna, place, locus, in such a reference indicates its indispensability everywhere. As the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: The whole world is founded on substance and established, maintained, kept going, by the continuous experience of substance (by conscious individuals). Even as Self and Not-Self are occupant and locus to one another, so are attribute and substance (reversed in reflexion).

After attribute and substance comes movement as included in them.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE PRINCIPAL VARIETIES OF SUBSTANCE, ATTRIBUTE, AND MOVEMENT.

Seven principal varieties of each.—Prevalence of septenates in our particular world-system.—Such distinctions conventional, for positive delimitation of any brahmāṇḍa impossible because of continuous inclusion of smaller in larger.—Kāla or Time equivalent to Mahaṭ, and Ḍik or Space to buḍḍhi-ṭaṭṭva.—Sensor and motor organs corresponding to these.—To be developed later.—At this stage of evolution, manifesting as mental functioning.—Seven bodies of human beings.—Seven layers in each atom.—Sampāḍana or development of these.—The seven guṇas.—Logia in terms of guṇas and not ḍravya.—Why.—The five known sense-qualities as the qualities of the five ḍravyas, and saṅkhyā or number as the quality of Kāla or Time, and samyoga or conjunction of ḍik or space.—Arithmetic and geometry, etc.—Considerations of geometry, trigonometry, etc., in connexion with ḍik.—Detailed consideration of ḍravyas in terms of logia in the *Shākhās* of the *Veḍas*.—Only cursorily touched upon here.—The peculiarity of scriptural sentences; each self-complete.

We no doubt speak ordinarily of nine substances and twenty-four attributes, etc., and these figures too are reconcilable with each other with the help of sub-divisions of triplets, yet in reality there are only seven substances proper, and seven attributes, and seven movements. It is true that all other numbers also, one, two, three, four, five, hundred, thousand, etc., have all an equal value and importance, and there is no peculiarity about seven, in the absolute sense. But the septenary number predominates in our particular b r a h m ā ṇ d a, as other numbers do in other systems, as a mere fact, (for any one number can only and must manifest in some given particular space and particular time). Indeed it is difficult to say even this (for how shall we define precisely the limits of any one system), all being connected with all (as so many parts of one continuous organism, or, in other words, as links in a continuous chain of individualities within individualities, and worlds within worlds in infinite number). Still, a certain conventional demarcation of limits and bounds is also unavoidable and necessary. Therefore, while feeling, all the time, 'within' ourselves that there is really no distinction between 'my' world-system and 'your' world-system, we may yet be permitted to speak of such for practical purposes.

These seven principal substances are the five well-known 'elements' and k ā l a or time and ḍik or space. The two others commonly included with these, *viz.*, Ā ṭ m ā and m a n a s, are the roots of all these seven, in reality, being only other names for the I and the This.[1]

Ḍ i k is, strictly speaking, an 'interval' of space, a quarter, a 'cardinal point,' as the *Nyāya* says. Public usage makes it a division or piece of space. Now it may be asked, why space in any form has been included in and with substances, when space is j ñ ā n a-p a r a, 'matter of cognition,' and substance is i c h c h h ā-p a r a, 'matter of desire' as time also is i c h c h ā-p a r a. Ordinarily, space should be counted with non-substances. The reply is that desire is impossible without cognition, and that at least in one aspect, space is essentially 'the possibility or principle of the co-existence of the many,' a n-e k a-p r a-s a m b h a v a,—and is therefore included with that 'many,' *viz.*, substances.[2] It

---

[1] This is a significant statement and useful to bear in mind as illuminative of many dark problems of superphysics, that m a n a s is metaphysically the Not-self. It is the final atom, at any given point of space and time with which the self identifies itself, for the time being, as with an u p ā ḍ h i.

[2] These remarks may be of help in understanding and reconciling the various views now current as

should be noted that, as a fact, ḍ e s h a or ḍ i k

---

to whether space or the intangible but luminiferous or other kind of 'ether' with which it is filled is 'solid' and 'rigid,' a plenum in short, or a vacuum; and on the other hand whether matter or the ultimate particles, atoms, super-atoms, ions, electrons, corpuscles, etc., however they be called, of which 'matter' is made up, are 'solid,' substantial, 'things,' or mere vacua, vacuoles, bubbles, vortices and rings of 'nothing,' holes in solid space, like air-bubbles in a lump of ice. (See Dolbear's *Ether, Matter and Motion* and Annie Besant's *Occult Chemistry*).

From the standpoint of the metaphysic expounded here it would seem that what is ultimately and essentially needed is a pair, and a pair of opposites, and, yet again, opposites which take on the characteristics of each other, in an endless reflexion, a ḍ h y ā s a. Even in current *Veḍānṭa*, the opening sentences of Shaṅkara's *Shārīraka-Bhāṣhya* briefly but efficiently indicate this fact or law. And, in this work, the preceding chapters, describing the pairs of P a r ā ṭ m ā and A p a r ā ṭ m ā, and again A p a r ā-P r a k ṛ ṭ i and P a r ā-p r a k ṛ ṭ i, and Light and Shade, etc., etc., are but a commentary on that basic principle. So vacuum and plenum, emptiness and solidity, things and room, both are necessary to the movement of the World-process. As to whether we shall keep up the present convention as to the names of the pairs

or reverse it, calling black white and white black, does not seriously matter. If justification is sought for the present convention or for its reversal, it will be found, for either, in the fact that each one of the pair has in it the potency of the other. If we look with greater attention to the one aspect, one set of names appears appropriate; if, taking up another standpoint, another position of mind, we contemplate the other aspect more closely, the reversal of the set of names seems to be more fitting. From the standpoint of the solid earth, immediately beyond its periphery is emptiness; but on further examination, from another standpoint, that emptiness is filled, for many miles at least, with air: and beyond that again, there *appears* emptiness, but really is a filling of still 'rarer' matter, and so on, endlessly, by parity of reasoning. On the other hand, also, from the standpoint of the air, looking downwards, instead of upwards, too, the earth may well appear as 'emptiness,' a 'privation' of air. 'Rarer' matter would apparently mean matter normally in a condition of smaller particles and with apparently and correspondingly smaller (but proportionately greater) intervals of space between the particles. From a certain standpoint, the fact of the greater minuteness of the intervals would give rise to the impression of solidity, plenitude, 'absolute filling;' while, from another, the greater mobility, yielding, of the particles, their more easily making room for denser-seeming bodies, would give rise to the impression of emptiness.

To the metaphysic expounded here, the d r a v y a aspect is *more* prominent in the Not-Self or matter than in the Self corresponding to space. Also d r a v y a or substantiality is inseparable from the two other aspects, *viz.*, sensuous-quality and movement or vibration, g u ṇ a and k a r m a. It is not possible to reduce any two of this ternary into terms of the remaining one only—as attempts are made from time to time in modern days, to reduce the other two into vibration. All three are *side by side*, none is *cause* to any other, really. Even less possible is it to abolish or explain away either one of the penultimate pair, though each contains the other; in endless proof of which we have Male-Female, active-passive, positive-negative, S h i v a-P ā r v a ṭ i, Nishedha-Shakṭi, sinks-wells (atoms), etc., etc., the hyphen being the third; and each of the three includes endless further triads. All philosophers, of all ages and all places, have only rung and can only ring changes on these three, Self, Not-Self, and the Relation between them. The *fact* of these three is indefeasibly recognised by all. The only and the endless dispute is as to the *nature* of each. All statements of all problems whatsoever can always be reduced into terms of these three. The forms of statement, the language, the names for the three, the aspects under which they are seen and presented, are recurrently new, like winter, summer and rain, but the essentials are eternally old. Psychology, abstract and subjective science, deals with the nature and aspects of the

herestands for the b u ḍ ḍh i-ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a, and k ā l a[1] for the m a h a ṭ-ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a.

These two are s ū k ṣ h m a, subtle (at the present stage and not yet in line with the other five). There should be sensor organs corresponding to these two as there are for the other five. But (at the present stage of human evolution) these sensor-organs appear only as working (subtly in the way of under-currents) in cog-

(individualised) Self, a d h y ā ṭ m a m. Physics, objective or material and concrete science, with the nature and aspects of the (particularised) Not-self, a ḍ h i b h ū ṭ a m. The science of the Force which plays between the two is aḍ h i-ḍ a i v a m. Of course all three overlap. The science of all three taken together in their universal aspect is metaphysic, *Veḍānṭa*, *Aḍhyāṭma-vidyā*, *par excellence*; in their individualised aspect, it is psycho-physics, *yoga*, including super-physics.

[1] K ā l a has just before been stated to be i c h c h-h ā-p a r a, connected with desire, it is also one of the names of Shiva, Kāla or Mahākāla; it also means dark or black; Garuḍa, the 'vehicle' of Viṣhṇu, is a 'portion' of Shiva (as are also, Sheṣha or Saṅkarṣhaṇa and Hanumān, also the weapon Suḍarṣhana which is also known as k ā l a-c h a k r a, the wheel or discus of time); and Garuḍa is often declared to be c h h a n ḍ o-m a y a, composed of rhythm and metre; and c h c h n ḍ a h specially belongs to the *Sāma Veḍa*, corresponding with desire, etc., etc.

nition or intellection generally. Without them, thinking, etc., mānasa-vichārāḍi, would be impossible.[1] These two subtler ṭaṭṭvas or substances appear in the liṅga, sūkṣhma and kāraṇa bodies in the same way as the other five, because of (their) interdependence. But, in reality, (that is to say, from one standpoint, at least) there are seven bodies in the human being, as indeed, in every atom, each body being composed of one ḍravya or substance. The evidence therefor is this, *viz.*, that if each body or sheath were complete in itself then interdependence with others were meaningless; but such interdependence exists as a patent fact, and no jīva dwells or lives exclusively and solely either in the kāraṇa, or in the sūkṣhma, or in the liṅga, or in the sṭhūla body, or in any of the higher three,

---

The 'belongings' of Shiva, on the other hand, the bull Nanḍi, etc., are similarly made up in terms of Vishṇu and space. All these correspondences are significant.

[1] The text is exceedingly compressed and obscure here. I can only hope that I have caught the meaning. तत्र समस्त्वपि द्रव्यद्वयं कालेशसंज्ञकं नाम महद्बुद्धिप्रयुक्तकं सूक्ष्ममेव. यद्यपि यथैतत्पंचानां पंचेन्द्रियमत्र भासते तथैव तस्यापीति. तथापि ज्ञानपरत्वेन तयोरिंद्रियाभासः. अत्रांशेऽपि तस्य कार्यमस्ति. तमन्तरेण मानसविचाराद्यसम्भवः. etc. See *The Science of Peace*, pp. 295—305.

a p a r a-ṭ r i ṭ a y a. (That is to say, the discrete, discontinuous, experiences of any one body require a thread of continuity in order that they may be strung together and take shape as the experience of a single individual, and this thread is supplied by a subtler inner body, stage after stage, endlessly, from the transcendental standpoint. From that of our particular world system) it is only when all the seven come together that work can be accomplished. It is true that residence in (*i.e.*, the confining or transferring wholly the centre of consciousness to) any single one of these at a time by the power of y o g a has been declared to be possible. But that is a special matter of s a m p ā ḍ a n a, procuration, bringing in, supplying, development by practice (? of the qualities of all the requisite constituents, in the material of any one body, by means of sub-divisions of that material, each such subdivision corresponding to one of the main seven) by means of the power, the energy of one's Self, s v a-s h a k ṭ i-b a l e n a. As the *Brahma-Suṭra* says: The realisation of all things everywhere is y o g a.

Such then are the seven ḍ r a v y a s and the seven bodies. And in them reside corresponding qualities and movements.

The next item presenting itself for treatment is g u ṇ a or quality (which manifests in

kāla, time, intension-intention, as ḍravya or substance has expression-extension in space).

Because guṇa corresponds to Āṭmā, and Āṭmā has precedence beyond all, therefore (is it said that the ṭan-māṭras precede bhūṭas and) the logia, *Mahā-vākyas*, (whereby the ṭaṭṭvas or bhūṭas are created) are in terms of the guṇas, not of ḍravyas.[1] But should not these logia, these ideations, be in terms of the ḍravyas, substances, which *contain* the attributes? The container being mentioned, the contents are mentioned *ipso facto*? Not so. Consider this. It is admitted on all hands that the occupant *defines* the locus, and not the locus the occupant. A person dwelling in a house can give it up and remove into another and still another and so on. The house has no similar power or quality of changing tenants or of detaining anyone so that he shall not be able to take another. And by all nīṭi, the logic of social relations, that which can take up or abandon, exercise control over another at

---

[1] See *infra*. The logion, consciousness or ideation 'I-sound-not (am)' gives rise to sound, and thence to the substratum of sound; *viz.*, ākāsha—and so on. The attributes or qualities define, demarcate, characterise or specify substances, to the *knower;* not *vice versa*; therefore taking precedence; *esse* is *percipi* here.

will, is superior to that which may be so taken up or abandoned and controlled helplessly. But do we not see very often that a person *is tied* to a place or position or office, by fate, in such a way that his livelihood, his very being depends on his keeping in and to that place or position, and that quitting of it would mean endless trouble to him? True; but the word 'fate,' in the question itself, provides the answer. The power that binds the person to the place is not in the place but in the fate, the 'to-be,' bhāvya, which is the person's own-doing or sva-karaṇa in the past, and that own-doing again is the result of own-nature or sva-bhāva (which, in reality is sva-bhāvana, self-imagination, one's own ideations, ideals, desires).

For such reasons, then, it happens that the guṇa-words, defining the corresponding substances inherently, are used by preference and precedence in the logia. The movements, karma, are implied and come between the two.

[1] The statement occurs repeatedly that karma comes between guṇa and dravya. It should have some particular significance which would probably repay investigation. Desire obviously falls between cognition and action. But the middle position of karma is not so obvious. Indeed in the triplets it comes last. But on repeating the triplet over and

There (? in the logia) the words designating qualities are 'projected' (on to the screen of) the This, the counter-reflexion, counterfoil or opposite of the Self; they are also projected on or into the Not and the Self. So also, karma abides in the Self, the Not-Self and the Not. With these five qualities, sound, touch, visibility, taste and smell, correspond and go (five kinds of karma, or vibrations) and the well-known five mahā-bhūṭas, ākāsha, vāyu, ṭejas, āpas, pṛṭhivi. These five 'abide in' time and space. These two, as already pointed out, are 'non-substances,' the opposite of substance, from one standpoint, *i.e.*, when they are regarded as the 'supports,' the 'loci,' *in* which substances exist. But, from another standpoint, (indeed, as *supports* of substances, they take on some shadow of the nature of substances, become

---

over again, it, from one standpoint, comes to stand between quality and substance. Kriyā and karma are, each last in its triad. But the other two pairs are reversed. There must be a reason. The subject is partially discussed in *The Science of Peace*, pp. 239-240. It would seem that comparatively, karma is the dominant factor in its triplet, as ichchhā in its. The 'ruling passion' specifies the man. The 'ruling vibration' defines the substance and quality, for existence, manifestation, is pre-eminently by motion.

like them, even while opposite to them); they also become substances (M a h a ṭ and b u ḍ ḍ h i). The quality belonging to time, as a pseudo-substance, is number, s a ṅ k h y ā; to space, s a m-y o g a; as the *Vaisheṣhika* declares. Time is succession and succession is number; therefore is s a ṅ k h y ā or number regarded as a g u ṇ a.[1] So s a m y o g a, conjunction, is a quality.

But is not space the s a m b h a v a, the possibility of the co-existence of the many, and is not 'many' number? No. The main idea of s a m-b h a v a is 'together-being,' co-existence;[2] and together-being is s a m y o g a, conjunction, simultaneity of the many and not their separation in a successive enumeration.

If conjunction is counted as a quality, why is *not* its correlative disjunction also counted as another? Simply because s a m y o g a tacitly implies v i b h ā g a and therefore it is not necessary to expressly mention more than one. V i-b h ā g a simply means divisions of space or in

---

[1] G u ṇ a means quality; also multiplication (G u ṇ a n a m); also a *rope* of many strands and so on.

[2] 'Possibility,' the current meaning of s a m-b h a v a, is allied to and derived out of this, being the existence of something hidden *in* or *with* the existence of something overt, and capable of subsequent unfolding.

space. (When detailed lists are given, it is mentioned also). Moreover, space, in the mentioning, necessarily and primarily calls up only *two* k a r m a s, steps (? points, simultaneously, in co-existence, which is s a m y o g a), a (simultaneous) third (also) being unnamable, unmentionable (?). (Hence s a m y o g a is the proper g u ṇ a to mention). V i y o g a does not do so well. ('I' and 'you' or 'this' are the only *two* things that occur in consciousness simultaneously and so make space. The 'many' details under the 'This' occur successively and make time, in strictness. When we think we are simultaneously cognising a large number of things, we are really lumping them all up into a single 'This').[1]

Space, as said before, is the possibility of the many. Possibility means 'may be' or 'may not be,' or 'may be otherwise.' Here, the third

[1] Compare the modern findings of psycho-physicists regarding simultaneous successive cognitions of the various parts of the 'field of vision,' for instance. It should be noted that all this text hereabouts is exceedingly obscure. I have translated more or less gropingly. Some of the geometrical expressions that follow are not known in current Samskṛṭ Geometry so far as I have been able to ascertain by enquiry. Y o g a-r e k h ā is however used in the sense of a 'compound line.'

alternative is indefinable. Therefore only the other two are taken into practical account. And these two correspond respectively with growth and decay. Hence space has two lines, ḍesha-rekhā ḍviḍhā. As the *Brahma-sūṭra* says: Space-definition, cricumscription, demarcation is (possible) by (means of) two lines, रेखाद्वयेन देशपरिच्चयेनम्(?). It is true that in the 'Science of Lines', *i.e.*, Geometry, etc., sixty-four lines are assigned to space, but two out of all these are the chief, *viz.*, the samyoga-line and the vivarṭa-line. The first is of the nature of vṛḍḍhi, growth, endless producibility or prolongation (by the sam-yoga, addition or conjunction, of new points), without beginning and without end. (It is the straight line). The other has beginning and end; it is kauṭilyā,[1] curved, spiral. All manifestations, cognitions, experiences of existence and non-existence, birth and death, beginnings and ends, are because or by means of this 'curved wandering round and round,' this continuous spiral. Distinctions of the various cardinal points, directions, quarters, divisions of space, also, all depend on this vivarṭa-rekhā;[2] while

---

[1] In modern Samskṛṭ this would be kuṭilā.

[2] Compare recent mathematical speculations as to space being "curved."

the samyoga-rekhā is said to include all directions, north, east, south, west, etc. For, as declared in the 'Science of Lines,' in space, by itself, there is no fixing possible of east, south, etc.

It is 'possible' that whatever is of the form or nature of vṛḍḍhi, growth, increase, development, evolution, progress, expansion, that only is the 'quality' of ḍesha or space. It may be said that the vivarṭa-rekhā (corresponding, as said before, to decay and contraction) is also a quality of space, yet it is assigned to kriyā and karma (while space corresponds to jñāna). Samyoga-rekhā corresponds to jñāna. Vivarṭa-rekhā to kriyā. That which is neither, aparivṛṭa, uncircumscribed, unlimited, is M. In terms of the Logion, the residence or establishment of the I in the This and the Not is samyoga; and that of the This in the Not and the I is vivarṭa. There are 'many' successions or varieties in the vivarṭa-rekhā, because of its correspondence with action, *e.g.*, lamba, perpendicular, karṇa, base, bhuja, side, koṇa, angle, etc.—corresponding respectively to A, U, M, and summation—and also all ḍvi-bhujas, figures of two sides, ṭri-bhujas, of three sides, chaṭur-bhujas, of four sides, and ḍvi-koṇas, 'biangles,' ṭri-koṇas, triangles, chaṭush-koṇas, quadrangles, etc.

All this Science of Lines (Geometry, Trigonometry, etc.) is needed for the measurement of brahmāṇḍas and samsāras. Hence the root-aphorisms of the science: By preceding and succeeding samyoga and vivarṭa arises kriyā; and, by lamba and karṇa, perpendicular and base, the measurement of space. In terms of the Logion: Production or prolongation of the nature of I-I-I, with base or support in This, and with 'remainder,' avashiṣhta, in or of Negation, is lamba. This-This-This, with base in I and remainder in Negation, is karṇa. Not-Not-Not, with base in This and remainder in I, is bhuja. I in I, This in This, This in I, I-Not-This, Not-I, Not-I, This-Not-This, I-Not-I—such is the form and nature of the koṇa. The repetition here, once, twice, thrice and so on, makes the two-sided, three-sided, four-sided, two-angled, three-angled, four-angled figures and so on.[1]

---

[1] It has been said already that the translation here is more or less groping. A few considerations taken from other theosophical literature may at least be suggestive if not quite completely elucidative. Lines, circles and spirals are partially discussed in *The Science of Peace*, ch. xii., p. 190 *et seq.*, under Motion, not Space, as linear or rotary or spiral motions. In practical embodiments, the relations between straight lines and curved lines or spirals

Detailed descriptions of these ḍ r a v y a s in terms of logia are to be found in the *Shākhās* of the *Veḍas*. They are briefly touched upon here only because the *Praṇava* includes everything and because all men have not the opportunity to study all works in detail, therefore was it the more necessary to refer to them here, so that if any one can study no more than just this one Science of the *Praṇava*, even he may carry away some little knowledge of 'everything.'

---

are illustrated by the diagrams of the atoms in *Occult Chemistry*, by Annie Besant and C. W. Leadbeater. The (minor) *Upaniṣhaḍs* and *Tanṭra*-works, indicate that the outline of the 'human atom' is similarly formed of the prāṇic currents flowing along the s u s h u m n ā, i d ā and p i ṅ g a l ā, in somewhat the same combination of two spirals around a straight stem, the caduceus-form. *Purāṇa*-allegories, of Shiva-Ruḍra, representative of a h a m-k ā r a or ego-ism manifesting as a pillar of light, wreathed round and round with serpents or forces, and 'the dance of Shiva' may be taken as indicating this amongst other facts. The diagram at p. 434, of *The Secret Doctrine*, vol. ii., (O. E.) illustrates another application of the same basic metaphysical principle, which in its most abstract form is enunciated by the two technical words of *Veḍānṭa*, k ū t a s ṭ h a and a n ā ḍ i-p r a v ā h a, an endless flow around a rock-like fixity. Rivers and mountains are but the still more dense embodiment of the same principle.

Some persons are wanting in leisure, some in power, some in intelligence, some in inclination, some are incapable of persevering application but must skip from one thing to another momentarily, some are men of action rather than of thought, some of feeling and emotion predominantly, some are interested only in some special branch of knowledge, some study only the *Veḍas*, some only some one *Aṅga*, some a *Shākhā* and so on. Briefly, the kinds, qualities and occupations of individual intelligence are endless. The result is that, though a full and proper scheme of study requires the mastering

---

The word vivarṭa, used here to indicate the curved line, has a special technical significance in current *Veḍānṭa*, which exactly fits in with the line of thought followed in the text. It means, 'opposite, reverse, inversion, a turning round, a reversal' etymologically. And the manifested world is said to be a vivarṭa of the Absolute, the opposite of it *viz*., the Relative, which however is *included within* the Absolute and *not outside* of the latter (as conceived by Spencer, making his foundations defective). (For vivarṭa-vāḍa, see *The Science of Peace*, ch. ii). The Limited is the opposite of the Unlimited; Māyā of Brahman. Even so is the curved line, including all figures—for every figure may be regarded as made up by the bendings and curvings of a single line which would otherwise be straight

of all the departments of knowledge in successive and well-defined order, yet, because 'disorder' is also a *fact* in the World-process and is inevitably included in the Universal Scheme, therefore peculiarities and idiosyncracies in teachers as well as taught have to be counted upon and provided for. This is done by means of special treatises suited to special times, places, cycles and circumstances—whereas the Science of the *Praṇava* is a resumé in brief of the whole circle of knowledge, giving a general outline of all the most important principles which have a universal applicability and are of constant recurrence in all the special departments of knowledge. It is because of this reason that the study of this science is so much insisted on. Without a thorough understanding of this science it is difficult, indeed impossible, to really understand the heart of any other science. As the *Kalpa-Shāsṭra* explains, in the Ā r ṣ h a and Ā r c h i ṭ a works, treatises composed for the instruction of mankind by Ṛ ṣ h i s

—the opposite of the straight line. Even so is k r i y ā, with which the former corresponds, the opposite of j ñ ā n a, with which the latter correesponds. Even so is manifold and tortuous error the opposite of the single and straight truth. Even so is endlessly various restlessness the opposite of unvarying rest.

and Incarnations, each verse, each sentence, is made self-complete[1] and satisfactory; yet also some work is needed which gives a connected survey of the whole of the World-process and enables us to perceive the underlying connexion between even such apparently self-complete sentences.

---

[1] This characteristic may be noted as present, in very various degrees of course, in most scriptural and inspirational writing, (even such travesties of it as those obtained at spiritistic séances. Of course in the one case they are luminous aphorisms pregnant with meanings and applications; in the other disjointed babble and un-satisfactory counterfeit). The reason seems to be that the higher order of mind, seeing 'from above,' so to say, looks at laws and principles *more than* at particular facts, and expresses them chiefly.

SECTION III. (*Continued*)

CHAPTER XXXIV.

THE EVOLUTION OF DRAVYAS

Nyāya-method of determining the logia.—'I-number-not'.—'I-conjunction-not.'—Mahat and buḍḍhi-ṭaṭṭvas.—Sense-organs and qualities corresponding to these.—Other names, āḍi for buḍḍhi-ṭaṭṭva, anupāḍaka for mahaṭ-ṭaṭṭva.—Reasons.—Gradual evolution of ṭaṭṭvas in successive manvanṭaras, together with corresponding qualities and senses.—Various kinds of brahmāndas.—Samvṛṭa and pravṛṭa, the qualities of āḍi and anupāḍaka.—Bṛhan-mānasa and hṛṭ, their sense-organs.—Considerations as to the normal development of these in the course of ages and manvanṭaras, and their abnormal development by yoga.—Organs of production corresponding to the two.

The knowledge of universal principles is the knowledge of the succession—which itself is the chain of causation—of the items in the ideation of Mahā-Vishṇu. This knowledge itself, again, is the nirṇaya, decision, which is defined in the *Nyāya* as the determination

of a question, a subject-matter, by the comparative examination of both sides of that question, the p a k ṣ h a and the p r a ṭ i p a k ṣ h a. These two sides are always present in every question, as action and reaction. The triplet here is p a k ṣ h a ṭ ā, p r a ṭ i-p a k ṣ h a ṭ ā and a p a k ṣ h a ṭ ā, one side, the opposite, and the no-side, the impartial or true view, the adjusting and reconciling mean between the two extremes. By this method of examination of both sides, we determine the form of the appurtenant logia (referred to at the end of the last chapter).

Thus we have the (first) logion, 'I-this-number-not.' Here I, the Self, is regarded as 'amongst or seated in or amidst' the ḍ r a v y a s, being the ninth of them, though different from all; and for this same reason, 'This' is mentioned here too (in conjunction or as identical with the I—the two together forming the root-substance, the substratum of all the seven manifestations which appear as the seven substances, by the imposition of the seven attributes upon that root-substance). The s a ṅ k h y ā or number, 'experienced' or ideated by it (*viz.*, by this root-substance, a combination of I and This, which combination has now taken the place of the I alone of the Primal Logion) takes up now the proper

place of the This (*i.e.*, the second place in the Primal Logion), because number resides in the This (as its most tenuous, indefinite, ultimate and universal quality; countability comes next after pure this-ness or objectivity); and that same This, here, is Time regarded as a ḍ r a v y a, substance, whose qualities are number and succession. Its v i v a r ṭ a n a, turnings on itself, revolutions, 'This, This, This,' are one, two, three, etc. Their dissolution by means of the subsequent 'negation' is (brought about by the Logion) 'Number-Not-I,' and 'Number-I-Not.' There is no variation here in the consistent and uniform nature of 'time,' *i.e.*, I-Number-Not in the present as well as the past and the future. (?) Number, or the emptiness, and nothingness of number is uniform in past, present and future. (?) (It is the primary and most unvarying, unchanging of attributes, whence the 'certainty' of Arithmetic, the science of numbers, more certain than even the next department of mathematics, *i.e.*, geometry, the practical or actual embodiments of which can never be said to be *quite exact*, *e.g.*, a visible point, or line, or circle, or right angle never really exactly answer the ideal of the definition.) The 'revolution,' circling round upon itself (as the I does in the Primal Logion, going out into the Not-I and then,

by means of the Negation, returning to itself in asmi or 'Am') is thus a triplet also, *viz.*, past, present, future, for the limits or boundaries of time depend on the vṛṭṭi, the 'circling,' 'mode of existing,' manifestation, mood or psychosis of the I, and within each boundary, each definite psychosis, there is this succession of three.

The next legion is, 'I-Conjunction-not.' Manyness, countability, being the (first) attribute of This, the Objective, conjunctions take place in the many, the numberful, the numerous or countable (the separate points). When we apprehend conjunctions, co-existences of more than one, of many ones, at that same time we apprehend space. And when we apprehend these then only really do we fully apprehend the 'turnings' (of time and 'so many times' or number).[1] Out of these (points in conjunction of

[1] The current *Nyāya* and *Vaisheṣhika* regard 'number' as having a peculiar 'magnifying' and positive energy; though they fail to explain it. In *The Secret Doctrine*, the importance of 'number' is dwelt upon repeatedly; sometimes it is stated there that 'number' in the abstract has potencies, at other times this is denied and it is explained that it is only substances or vibrations in given numbers than can produce special results. The above text and what follows seem to suggest that these

various kinds, arise and) come within our apprehension, lines, perpendicular, base, side, angle, etc.

When m a h a ṭ and b u ḍ ḍ h i are understood in place of time and space, then p r a v ṛ ṭ i and s a m v ṛ ṭ i replace conjunction and number (or, to put them in the respective order, number and conjunction).[1] P r a v ṛ ṭ i is that quality whereby the j ī v a enters exceedingly into the world, into matter, in the spirit of separate individuality. S a m v ṛ ṭ i, on the other hand, is also staying in the world, but with

---

metaphysico-mathematical abstractions, belonging to the science of number (or arithmetic), of lines (or geometry, trigonometry, conic sections, etc.) and a third not expressly discussed in the text, *viz.*, that corresponding to motion (and force), as these do to time and space, (or dynamics and statics), are not *mere* emptinesses, but help the individualised consciousness to pass gradually into denser and denser, more and more concrete and definite 'physics' or 'physical experience.' By repetition, by circumscription, by turning round and round, what is vague becomes intensified, defined, confirmed, solidified.

[1] The compounds are so mixed here in the text that it is very difficult to say with certainty what the precise respective order is. But in view of the context, before and after, it seems proper to assign s a m v ṛ ṭ i to b u ḍ ḍ h i or ā ḍ i-ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a

an all-embracing knowledge of and consideration for all and the ways and the needs of all.[1] Pravṛṭi corresponds to the Not-Self; Samvṛṭi to the Self. That which is different from both is shānṭi, wherein there is neither pravṛṭa nor samvṛṭa, but mere carrying out of the 'to-be,' bhāvya.

(corresponding to space) and pravṛṭi to mahaṭ, anupāḍaka (time). But the why and wherefore are not quite clear, of the succedence and precedence between time and space on the one hand and āḍi and anupāḍaka on the other. In various *Purāṇas*, *e.g.*, the *Vāyu*, ch. iii. and vi. mahaṭ-ṭaṭṭva and bhūṭāḍi are mentioned. Some of those continual inversions in reflexion seem to come into play here.

In the current works on *Sāṅkhya*, mahaṭ is said to issue first from Prakṛṭi, and then ahaṅkāra from mahaṭ, and bhūṭāḍi is said to be a sub-division of ahaṅkāra from which the five ṭanmāṭras come forth.

[1] Even when mahaṭ and buḍḍhi replace time and space, even then the author, in describing their nature, keeps up throughout the mixture of psychological or subjective, and physical or material and objective, aspects. Strictly these two should be 'elements' side by side with and in the same way as ākāsha, vāyu, etc. But even while this is almost explicitly mentioned, the aspects of consciousness which predominate on and go with the

As there are i n ḍ r i y a s (sensor and motor organs) corresponding to the five known ṭ a ṭ ṭ-v a s, so are there to these two also. When the various aspects of p a ḍ ā r ṭ h a s are describ-ed, p a ḍ ā r ṭ h a-p r a p a k ṣ h a-p r a v a c h a n é, then it is said that, smell, taste, etc., are appre-hended by nose, tongue, etc. But the other two are not generally known. The reason is this: Seven m a n v a n ṭ a r a s make a m a h ā-m a n-v a n ṭ a r a, and two Manus make a m a n v a n-ṭ a r a. The organs of sensation and production are gradually and successively evolved during

---

planes of matter that they constitute, are most prominently mentioned, in the same way as that intelligence corresponds with and has for vehicle the a g n i-ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a or matter of the mental plane. The reason is obvious. The actual sense-qualities are simply inconceivable by us, in the absence of the appropriate sense-organs. The words p r a v ṛ ṭ a and s a m v ṛ ṭ a are not to be met with in ex-tant Samskṛṭ works. S a m v ṛ ṭ i in the sense of 'false conception' occurs in Buḍḍhist literature (*The Secret Doctrine*, I. 48). S ā m v ṛ ṭ a m occurs in Vāchaspaṭi's *Yoga-Bhāṣhya-Ṭīkā* in a peculiar sense. S a m v ṛ ṭ a in Samskṛṭ grammar has a technical meaning which does not apply here. And the current words p r a v r ṭ ṭ a and p r a v r ṭ ṭ i are different from the p r a v ṛ ṭ a and p r a v ṛ ṭ i of the text, though, as p r a v ṛ ṭ i is defined above there is an alliance in the meaning.

the period of evolutionary growth in the mahā-manvanṭara. In this brahmānda, we a.e in the fourth manvanṭara and the reigning Manu is the seventh, as may be ascertained from the *Iṭihāsas*, histories. In each manvanṭara, side by side with the evolution of one ṭaṭṭva, there are evolved organs for the apprehension and the production of the quality of that ṭaṭṭva (as *e.g.*, the ear and the vocal apparatus, for respectively perceiving and uttering sound, the quality of ākāsha). The details of these matters are infinite. In this World-process which is aṭīṭa (past, or past computation) there are brahmāndas wherein there is only empty space, (?) kevalam ḍesha-māṭram-eva-shūnyam (starless spaces), which have (external) bounds (to their emptiness, set by other spaces occupied by systems, and also internal bounds) set by the might of time (which rules that they shall be empty only for so long, and then be occupied ?). There are other brahmāndas where there is only mahaṭ or only buḍḍhi or only ākāsha or only vāyu, etc. Others again where there are some few of these. Others where all seven are present, but without full manifestation of the qualities of all, and without full development of corresponding organs. Yet again there are others wherein

all substances, all attributes, and all organs are fully evolved and functioning. In our system, from the beginning up to the end of the fourth manvanṭara, five organs, with corresponding qualities and substances, have become manifest. Mahaṭ and buḍḍhi are also present, but because of the absence of kāla-vyavasāya, time-determination, (the proper time which is set by and is identical with the ideation, the purpose, the will, determination, desire, ichchhā of Kāla or Shiva, one name of the Logos of the system) they are latent, and so are their corresponding qualities and organs. When the manvanṭara (? mahā-manvanṭara) is complete, they too will become complete, *i.e.*, fully evolved, as the *Veḍa* declares.[1] While they remain undeveloped no use can be made of the ṭaṭṭvas. Indeed, as the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: Only that is called a ṭaṭṭva which has qualities and organs corresponding to it.

[1] The apparent lack of symmetry in the text may be explained on the theosophical view that on each of the seven globes of each manvanṭara or round, there evolve in succession seven root-races; and these, by the law of analogy, roughly recapitulate in a smaller scale, the total of the seven rounds of the ma'hā-manvanṭara, so that though in a much milder degree, the remaining two

Also the *Mīmāmsā*: A ṭaṭṭva can be utilised only by means of qualities and organs.

The buḍḍhi-ṭaṭṭva is also called the āḍi-ṭaṭṭva; it is the 'first'; and when it is complete and perfectly manifest, then evolution is complete.[1] The mahaṭ-ṭaṭṭva is similarly called the anupāḍaka-ṭaṭṭva, because as yet it has no upāḍaka, no 'receiver,' and so cannot be cognised though existent. It is only by means of inḍriyas, organs, that all things can be taken, 'received,' cognised. It is true that, from the metaphysical standpoint, all things are being constantly cognised by and in the transcendental consciousness, everywhere; (and this fact has a practical bearing on, and indeed is the cause of, yoga-development and evolution generally, in succession, in the limited); but we are here occupying the standpoint of

---

ṭaṭṭvas and organs will be manifested by the end of this manvanṭara also. More details on these points, though still all too few, may be found in *The Secret Doctrine* and in Mrs. Besant's *Pedigree of Man* and other theosophical works. The *Yoga-Vāsiṣhtha* and some of the *Upaniṣhats* indicate that there are not only seven but an infinite number of ṭaṭṭvas.

[1] The rule of inversion between cause and effect, the 'ideal' and its picture in the 'real,' subtle and gross, may be seen working in this fact.

the ordinary cycle. From that standpoint, the anupāḍaka-ṭaṭṭva begins to show activity in the sixth manvanṭara, for the sixth sense and its appropriate quality appear then. In the last manvanṭara, the āḍi-ṭaṭṭva manifests and all seven senses and seven qualities are completed. As the *Veḍa* declares: "From the āḍi, mahaṭ; from mahat, vyoma; from vyoma, maruṭa; thence, ṭejas; thence, āpas; thence, pṛṭhvī. Smell is mine; taste is mine; vision is mine, touch is mine, sound is mine, pravṛṭa is mine, samvṛṭa[1] is mine; thence all bhūṭas or elements and their arṭha, *i.e.*, purpose, use or significance, or modifi-

---

[1] Panḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja specially pointed out that there is only one ṭ in these words, which implies the verb-root, vṛ, to envelope, to cover, to screen or hide, different from the vṛṭ, to exist, which is the root of pravṛṭṭi, nivṛṭṭi, etc. 'Smell is mine,' etc., seems to belong to some different version from that now current of these *Veḍa*-verses—for pravṛṭa and samvṛṭa, etc., are not to be found in the current version—which forms part of the more elaborate sanḍhyā. The significance of these verses seems to be that the 'I,' the self or individuality of the reciter, is put into relation with all the principal factors of the World-process.

cations and transformations, and all a u s h a ḍ-h a, or medicines, and all these other things whatever, names, cognitions, believable or unbelievable, real or illusory, developed, undeveloped, becoming, non-becoming, otherwise-becoming, etc."

To go into further details and specifications about these two unknown ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s would be useless labor (like describing the wealth of the visible to those born blind). Their existence may be realised by means of y o g a, and persons wishful to perceive them should strive by that means. But even for purposes of y o g a, ordinarily only the known five are taken into account, for y o g a, 'yoking' of the mind, concentration, meditation, union, in, on, to, or with the unknown is difficult, and the very difficult is, commonly, the useless. Hence the n i r o ḍ h a, restraint, of only five v ṛ ṭ ṭ i s, moods, modifications, ways of existence, psychoses of the mind, is spoken of in current *Yoga*-Science, though that of seven might have been. As the *Kalpa-sūṭra* says: Only that should be discussed in any given place, which is (to some extent, at least) known (and therefore of interest) there. V ṛ ṭ ṭ a is v y ā p ā r a, operation, activity, functioning. The n i r o ḍ h a-k a r a ṇ a, restraint, thereof is ṭ a ṭ ṭ r a-s ṭ h a-b h a v a n-a u c h i ṭ y a, "the

propriety of becoming established there," as is stated in the *Yogākara* (a treatise on *Yoga* [1]). Hence the *Veḍa* says, variously: Slay the seven v ṛ ṭ ṭ i s, the five, the four, etc. This is said according to the occasion and the aspirant on which and to whom the direction is addressed.

---

[1] The explanations of v ṛ ṭ ṭ i and n i r o ḍ h a given here are different from those to be found in the current books; though not necessarily irreconcilable with these. The current interpretations say that the five kinds of v ṛ ṭ ṭ i are truth, error, doubt or fancy, sleep and memory. But each of the five kinds of sensation gives rise to all these five subjective modifications. And this indeed seems to be the significance of the word of the *sūṭra* पंचतय्यः 'pentads'. As to n i r o ḍ h a, the current explanation is 'restraint,' 'restriction,' 'prevention' and thence complete 'abolition.' This, at first sight is the exact opposite of what is said in the text, but it really is not. What is said here corresponds to that *preliminary* n i r o ḍ h a of the current works which amounts to e k ā g r a ṭ ā, one-pointedness. Even to abolish a thing we have first to concentrate on it; to dismantle a building is first to work on it with pick and shovel. Some old and also some current methods of meditation show that each grosser sense and plane is to be successively 'reduced' and 'dissolved' and then extended and reformed into the next subtler.

That these two ṭaṭṭvas are present now is due to the fact that they were present in the original ideation of Mahā-Vishṇu, by which ideation this system was evolved, is maintained, and will be dissolved. That we can think about them at all is due to this same fact (for that divine ideation is latent in our thought also). The sense-organ belonging to the anupāḍaka-ṭaṭṭva is hṛṭ, and that of the āḍi, bṛhan-mānasa.[1]

[1] In current Samskṛt, the words mean 'heart' and 'large heart.' It may be that the germs of these organs are connected with or placed somewhere near the present physical human heart; or the words may be a blind; or both. The theosophical idea seems to be that as all the sensor organs, or at least their nerve-centres, are in the head, the new ones should be there too, and probably correspond with the pituitary body and the pineal gland. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that all the rest of the organism is represented in the head by corresponding centres and ganglia, so that there may be organs both near the heart, and in the head; or again, the sensor organs may be in one place, and the corresponding productive ones in another; or, yet again, they may be in one place now, and may remove elsewhere in a later stage of evolution, with a new shaping of the body. Theosophical literature, *Ṭanṭra*-works, some of

On the appearance of the bṛhan-mānasa, experience of the (objects of) kāma-loka, etc., and on that of the hṛṭ, of the (plane or world of the) liṅga-sharīra, etc., becomes possible, in the same way as with the (known) five senses, (of their objects). On fuller development of them, knowledge of the kāraṇa-sharīra (plane), etc., is also gained, and travelling about in Kāma-loka, Svarga-loka, etc., becomes possible. It is true that sometimes experience of Kāma-loka, etc., is secured without the development of any other than the known five senses, yet that is an exceptional case of yoga.[1] Such yoga-effort is needed for all transformation of the less-known into the well-known; it is

---

the minor *Upaniṣhaṭs*, dealing with the various chakras, along or parallel to the neuraxis, in correspondence with the ṭaṭṭvas, may be looked up by the reader interested in such researches.

[1] The confusion between 'new' ṭaṭṭvas, inḍriyas and guṇas, on the one hand, and the *subtler forms* of the five old ones and their mental aspects, is kept up throughout; see the unsatisfactory discussion of this point in the text later on. Even in modern theosophical literature, the same difficulty is to be met with: it is said that the pituitary body and the pineal gland, will be the two new organs, but the one will

needed for even the discovery of new shades and forms of the objects of the known senses, sounds, colors, tastes, etc., not now recognised by human senses, (as being above or below their capacity). It is with reference to such effort that v ṛ ṭ ṭ i s should be restrained in the practice of yoga. As already indicated, the restraint of (many) v ṛ ṭ ṭ i s (in the plural) means becoming wholly identified with (one) v ṛ ṭ ṭ i (in the singular). For v ṛ ṭ ṭ i means activity, and activity is incessant and can never be abolished wholly.[1] In other words, the checking of v ṛ ṭ ṭ i, in the sense of indeterminate restlessness of mind, a v y a v a s ā y a, helpless vacillation between many things,

---

give 'clairvoyance' and the other 'thought transference' which are not two *new sensations* but only, so to say, *extensions* of the present senses of vision and the power of linguistic or pictorial communication.

[1] This helps to show that the distinction drawn in current *Yoga*, between s a m p r a j ñ ā ṭ a and a s a m p r a j ñ ā ṭ a too is, from one standpoint, one only of degree, like that between light and darkness. A s a m p r a j ñ ā ṭ a is also only *apparent* absence of *all* psychoses. The *Yoga* system admits that s a m s k ā r a or 'impressional tendency and seed' remains and is not *annihilated* even in K a i v a l y a.

without any attempt at control of or by one-self—the checking of this and the reduction of it into one-pointedness is *yoga*. In its highest form it becomes the reduction and realisation of all things whatever, all the multifariousness of the World-process, into and in the Unity of the Self. In such fashion, then, may the organs of the *mahaṭ* and *buḍḍhi-ṭaṭṭvas* be also evolved by *yoga*.

But, it may be asked, should not these sense-organs be on a level with, side by side with, of the same kind as, the known five, (should stand to each other and to the five in the same way as the five do to each other)? What is the significance of connecting them specially with Kāma-loka, etc.? For these latter we already experience (to a greater or less extent) during the conditions of dream and slumber (even without any other than the five senses)?

(One answer, the preliminary one, is that) it is true that these subtle worlds are also within our experience, and now; but yet this is so only with an intervening screen, as it were; and, in this fashion, we may indeed say that all knowledge, all experience whatever, is already within our consciousness; for our self is the Self, and the Self includes everything, past, present and future. But

from the 'practical' standpoint of the successive, the removal of this screen, the reduction of the sleeping into the waking consciousness, is a desirable end, worthy of effort. Hence the propriety of striving to evolve new senses by y o g a.[1] So take a familiar illus-

[1] This is all the answer given, and it is obviously not complete and not satisfactory. Perhaps the purpose of the elusive answer is to stimulate the reader's mind to the needed y o g a-effort! Let us suppose that in the previous four races of the m a n v a n ṭ a r a, only four senses were developed, of hearing, touch, sight and taste; and a book, corresponding to the *Praṇava-vāḍa*, stated to the fourth-race reader that when the fifth sense was developed he would begin to perceive in the waking condition, the affairs of Kāma-loka—which would be existent then too—and also stated that the fifth sense would be on a par with ear, skin, eye and tongue. Presumably the fourth round reader would find it difficult to understand these perplexing statements! We, of the fifth race may not improperly guess that he should have understood some such thing as this, *viz.*, that when the fourth race j ī v a was surfeited with his four physical sensations, his consciousness, (by unconscious or conscious n i r o ḍ h a) would retire inwards, and, so returning, would, as a first result, obtain experience of their subtler and more refined or Kāma-loka aspects and,

tration, showing how all is simultaneously present and yet has to be striven for in successive parts: At any one time we are actually engaged in doing some one thing only; but we are, usually, at that same time, thinking about a whole crowd of other matters, not immediately relevant, but still having a reference to our future possible needs, and our successive actions are governed and guided by these our considerations of future affairs. On the other

---

then tiring of that also, would gradually develop a regular and proper *new* sense, the nose, first on the subtler plane, then on the grosser, (then again on the subtler on a higher level of the spiral, to be followed by the sixth *new* sense, etc.) If this guess be correct, then we can interpret the text here similarly. The guess is supported by the fact that, at the present day, abnormal development is not in the direction of a true new sixth sense, just yet, but of clairvoyance, clairaudience, telepathy, etc., that is to say, of an immense refinement and extension of the functions of the known five senses.

There is also another way of looking at the matter. Each ṭaṭṭva while having a specific sense-quality, also subserves in a peculiar manner, one or other of the modifications of the three main aspects of consciousness, in any given individual organism. Thus, pṛṭhvi possesses smell

hand, we also see that many actions are simultaneously commenced and carried on by a number of co-workers, each executing one portion of a comprehensive scheme which includes all the separate activities and has an organic unity because planned out by one supervisor. In these ways we may reconcile simultaneity and succession.

But now another question may be asked. Even if a forced development of new senses were possible, is it justifiable? Would it not be a violation of the cyclic laws? The illustration just given helps us to an answer here also. All is the work of the Self, ultimately.

---

and predominantly subserves action in the human being; while ā p a s possesses taste and subserves desire; and a g n i possesses color and subserves cognition. Again, v ā y u possesses touch and is peculiarly a vehicle for that higher form of desire which is the universal love underlying wisdom or b u ḍ ḍ h i; and ā k ā s h a, possessed of sound, subserves the higher activity—of Ā ṭ m i c 'action'. In this wise, too, sometimes, ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s are described not by reference to their specific sense-quality but to the peculiar modification or aspect of consciousness that they especially subserve; and in the case of elements for the specific sense-qualities of which we have no senses, the latter description would obviously be the only one at all intelligible.

The ordainer of the cyclic succession is the Self. When, therefore, an overpowering wish is felt within any self for such 'abnormal' development, it is indication, nay proof, that, in that self, the cyclic law itself requires that apparently abnormal evolution for its own fulfilment—so that it is no longer really abnormal. If the world had to be *created*, it would be a truly difficult matter, (? *i.e.*, if there were a personal extra-cosmical creator, then the argument followed above would not hold good). As it is, although, apparently, the guidance of world-evolutions seems a very gigantic and most difficult task, yet it is easy because every atom evolves by its own inherent necessity and energy (and so, too, whatever can or may be or is actually evolved is its own justification and is in accordance with and not a breach of cyclic law).

Another question. We observe that for every organ of sensation, j ñ ā n e n ḍ r i y a, we have a corresponding organ of action or re-production, k a r m e n ḍ r i y a. Therefore, to the two new sense-organs will correspond two motor or productive organs also. What may be the names of these and of their functions? No, the names cannot be given. It would be most utterly useless and improper. The names depend upon the practice, and the practice upon y o g a; and they

must be learnt and acquired by proper yoga only ; real knowledge about them confers powers of action. In the ordinary course, these new organs of action will appear in the next two manvanṭaras, together with the correrpond-ing sense-organs.[1]

---

[1] It has been repeatedly indicated in footnotes before, and is expressly stated in the text here, at p. 116 *supra*, that a real karmenḍriya is an organ for reproducing the sense-quality which is apprehended by the corresponding jñanenḍriya, as ear or shroṭra and vocal apparatus or vāk. The other organs currently called karmenḍriyas are so only in an indirect and subordinate sense.

SECTION III. (*Continued*).

CHAPTER XXXV.

VIBRATION.

Résumé.—The form of the logia pertaining to ā k ā s h a, etc.—Reason for the form.—Objections. —Answers.—Vibration, the manifestor of qualities. —Expansion and contraction, action and reaction, in-breathing and out-breathing, s p a n ḍ a and s p - h u r a ṇ a.—Logia connected with other substances and qualities.—Relations with space, time, m a-n a s and b u ḍ ḍ h i.—The conditions and laws governing vibration.—The physiology of human vocal vibrations.

In the preceding chapter we dealt with the two less-known ṭaṭṭvas and their logia. The logia relating to ā k ā s h a are, 'I-This-Sound-Not,' 'Sound-I-Not,' 'Not-I-Sound' and 'Sound-Not-I.' Here, in the first logion, the 'this' takes the place of ā k ā s h a, while sound is obviously the attribute thereof.

Why was not the logion worded like thus, *viz.*, 'I-Ā k ā s h a ful-Soundful-not'? Ā k ā-s h a-possessing, sound-possessing, would have been good and proper adjectives for the Self, would they not? (The superimposed 'identity'

would run better and more feasibly by means of the idea of possession than that of absolute identity, and especially with reference to the *quality*, sound, etc., which is patently the *object* only of the subject and so almost impossible to *identify* with it, while the *substance* ā k ā s h a *may* somehow be thus even identified with I, for we speak of '*my* body' as 'I'?)

True, but the use of the affix m a ṭ u p (changing, by grammatical rule into v ā n, to make ā k ā s h a-v ā n, s h a b ḍ a-v ā n, etc., and having the significance of the affix 'ful') while making up good and proper adjectives would have been against the spirit of the logion. It would have indicated on its face a distinction, a separateness between the possessor and the possessed, whereas the purpose is to indicate and feel identity (and not mere possessorship; and it should be remembered that the g u ṇ a, or quality, sound, etc., cannot be ideated apart from substance and movement, and, indeed, for purposes of *manifestation* and *cognition*, in the cognitive aspect of the ideation, has even to come first).[1]

[1] This is why in the *Sāṅkhya*, the 'qualities,' sound, etc., are called the ṭ a n m ā ṭ r a s and are said to *precede* the b h ū ṭ a s or ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s and the i n ḍ r i y a s, for the *qualities* are the *determinants* of the substance *to the cogniser*, and Indian cosmogony proceeds from Consciousness, the

Another question. Why use the word 'this' at all in the first logion; even without it, the logion would have been complete enough and would have implied the 'this,' as 'I-Sound-Not'? The answer is, because, here, sound and I are both of the nature of k r i y ā, action, function, and are both present as such in the 'this.' Indeed, it might be said as another extreme, on the opposite side, that the proper form of the logion would have been 'Sound-this-not,' for sound as quality corresponds with, is first ideated by, and is regarded as identical with the Self, and may therefore well take the place of the Self in the logion. For this very reason, the logia connected with the description of p a r a m-ā ṇ u s, 'super-atoms,' are 'Sound-Ā k ā s h a-Not,' 'Not-Ā k ā s h a-Sound,' 'Sound-Not-Ā k ā s h a,' etc.

It should be noted here that all g u ṇ a s, qualities, are manifested by means of s p a n ḍ a and s p h u r a ṇ a. S p a n ḍ a is the a b h ī r ṇ a, vibration, of atoms, that is to say, their u p a-k ā r y a,[1] which takes place in them of itself,

---

Cogniser, outwards, instead of the reverse. The 'ideation' of the quality determines the vibration, and also the substance.

[1] We have had u p a k r i y ā before, in chapter xxiv. This u p a k ā r y a seems to be in the atom what the other is in the j ī v a.

independently. We thus find that sound arises by many vibrations of one atom. Touch, etc., also arise, in every atom, in the same way. The atom is smaller than the smallest; it cannot be perceived by the eye or the ear. And yet, by means of vibrations, sound, etc., arise or exist therein[1] (which are cognisable by our senses). We thus see that the anu-varḍhana, growth, development, evolution of everything depends upon and is an affair of spanḍa. The absence of spanḍa is sphuraṇa. It may be said that kriyā is universal and incessant, and that there are atoms within atoms, and so sphuraṇa, as cessation of activity, is

[1] The sentence seems to require a little metaphysical justification. If, as often said before, it is true that substance-quality-movement are inseparable, what can be meant by saying that an atom is too small to be heard, etc., without vibration? The substance-atom, the movement-vibration, and the quality-sound are coeval, inseparable in fact and in consciousness; how can we speak *as if* it was possible for an atom to exist without movement and quality and that *then* it would be or *is* too small, etc.? The justification is to be found in the shifting of thought between a subtler, the cause-plane, and a grosser, the effect-plane and taking the substance-aspect of the former and the quality-aspect of the latter.

impossible and is naught. But on the other hand, a beginning and an end are also necessary for every spaṇḍa (and these obviously imply a cessation of what preceded, however infinitesimal in time and space that cessation might be), and so the necessity for the appearance for sphuraṇa also is restored. Sphuraṇa is the praṭi-kriyā or reaction to the kriyā or action of spaṇḍa. In other words it is the pra-sambhava, the reduction from possibility into actuality, of the 'actuality' of inactivity, the kriyā of nishkriyā, during the existence or manifestation of action. Briefly, it is a matter of the necessity of both. But, surely, there is a difference between praṭi-kriyā and nishkriyā, reaction and inaction, as between positive and negative, being and non-being; how can the two be identified? This way; just consider that inaction, cessation from activity, is the seed and root and commencement of reaction; so much so is this the case that inaction has been said to be the substratum and supporting background of both action and inaction. Hence, in an exposition of spaṇḍa, sphuraṇa appears as the originator of reaction as well as action. Because there is no distinction between producer and produced, originator and originated, cause and effect, therefore is nishkriyā declared to be both active and reactive. Hence the

declaration that the world vibrates and strains, 'spanḍaṭe and sphuraṭe,' inbreathes and outbreathes, in every atom.

Spanḍa, vibration, corresponds to A; sphuraṇa, strain (?), to U; and sphulana, swelling, expansion or circular movement (?), the negation of both, to M. As the *Brahma-sūṭra* says: By spanḍa and sphuraṇa is sphulana, and that is jagaṭ, the 'moving world.' Or as the *Mīmāmsā*: The vyavahāra behavior, activity, of spanḍa and sphuraṇa is karma, movement, action.[1]

[1] Modern Samskṛṭ has lost the distinction between spanḍa, sphuraṇa, and sphulana. The *Ākhyāṭa-chanḍrikā*, a thesaurus of verb-roots, puts them all together, sphuraṭi, sphulaṭi and spanḍaṭe, as meaning spanḍana, striving. In current works, all three are indiscriminately used (sphulaṭi is less common) in the sense of striving, struggling, writhing; sphuraṭi is also used in the sense of throbbing, palpitating; and again of sparkling, twinkling; and finally of shining out or appearing in the mind as an idea. Another form, sphuraṭé, has the sense of "being able." It is obvious that all these senses are allied and pass from one to another gradually. Sphulana has at present more the significance of puffing, 'swelling' up and down, spherical expansion and contraction.

In this condition of things the translation of the text is naturally only tentative, and has been made

Atoms may be 'experienced,' perceived, by Y o g a. And the counsel is therefore given to aspirants to strive to so 'experience' them.

---

with reference to possible similarities in modern thought. 'Vibration' needs no recommendation. S p h u r a ṇ a or 'strain' may be regarded as the condition of the neutral moment or point, on 'both sides' of which the vibrations takes place, the turning-point between action and reaction. S p h u l a n a seems to be the 'breathing' of the atom, if it is regarded not as a vortex-*ring*, but as a vortex-*bubble*. S p h u l i ṅ g a, spark, seems to be connected with s p h u l a n a, the result of excessive swelling apparently being the radiating off of sparks. Mrs. Besant's *Occult Chemistry* will help the reader in making up his opinions as to the sense of the text with reference to the various kinds of movements of the atom.

In the human being, regarded as an atom-unit for purposes of analogy, we may discern many currents up and down and also round and round with intervening pauses, on various planes, physical, etheric, astral, mental, etc. The skeleton of the human trunk has a resemblance to the atom as pictured in *Occult Chemistry*—which picture, by the way, represents it not as a ring but as a spheroidal cell or wire-work ball. Breathing regarded as physical s p h u l a n a, is subdivided into inspiration, expiration and retention. The day is similarly subdivided for purposes of s a n ḍ h y â. And so on.

On the perception of atoms, exact knowledge arises as to the precise vibrations, strains, etc., whereby the sense-qualities are produced, and this knowledge leads on to the successful performance of the work (of the hierarchs).

As there are four logia connected with ā k ā s h a, so are there four for each of the other elements, v ā y u, ṭ e j a s, ā p a s, p ṛ ṭ h v ī. Thus: 'I-this-touch-not,' 'touch-not-I,' 'I-not-touch,' 'not-I-touch.' By the energising of these logia, touch comes into manifestation as the quality of v ā y u. In connexion with ṭ e j a s, in the logia, 'I-this-r ū p a-not,' etc., the word r ū p a means the (specific, differential) object of the existing organ of vision, the eye;[1] the other logia are 'Form-not-I,' 'I-not-form,' 'Not-I-form.'

We have thus seven logia, which also are regarded as root-logia. They may be co-ordinated thus (from a new standpoint). Whatever is

[1] This specific statement seems to be made in order to distinguish the connotation of r ū p a, here, 'visible form including color,' from that more general sense of the word 'form' which may be said to attach to all substances, cognisable by other senses than the eye also—as in the metaphysical *Veḍānṭa*-phrase n ā m a-r ū p e, name and form, both being embodied in the objects and being expressible in the terms of any and every sense-organ.

found by experience as 'between' the I and the 'This'—that is time. This may be observed even in the pronunciation of every letter-sound. In such pronunciation, the p r a ḍ e s h a, indication or determination (? or location) of the work that is done by the extreme tip of the tongue, by its front part, its middle and its root—this successive determination (? or location) itself is time. It comes between 'I and This,' between 'This and not,' and between 'Not and I.' The condition of, or during, the pronunciation of Not, I, This, is also included in that (Not, I, This ?) and here we have the origin of time (?). Time existing, the existence of space is apprehended by means of work or motion; (they are the necessary conditions of all experience). Again, that wherein I, This and Not are placed, where they are persistently believed to be, on arrival at or in which, I and This cease to manifest or to be perceived—that is ḍ e s h a or space, s h ū n y a or vacuum, of the nature of Negation, wherein I and This move or are apprehended.[1] After space and time have thus originated (*i.e.*, begun to be apprehended), a n y a ṭ,

[1] All this context is very subtle and elusive, as is but natural when we are dealing with such 'emptinesses,' abstractions, as space and time. In this real abstract character, of course, they are simultaneously manifest or non-manifest, as we like

another, other, appears by that same Svabhāva by which time and space are projected. 'I-this-other-not' is the appurtenant logion. Here 'I' is space, 'this' is time, and 'other' substance there is 'not' than these. By the operation of this 'other,' there arises 'I' within 'I,' 'this' within 'this,' and 'not' within 'not.' The I within the I is manas. Because of this fact is manas counted among the ḍravyas. And, further, because of this interiorness is it the function of manas to prevent simultaneous cognitions (as of a doorkeeper who allows only one visitor to pass in at a time). Because there is a sva-bhāva, a nature or character, present in the I, therefore is an interiorness put into it, and in-ness (implying the opposing out-ness)

---

to think about it, together with equally empty 'motion.' But when they are semi-concrete, doing duty for buḍḍhi and mahaṭ, *some* slight succession is wanted, in manifestation, and yet is difficult to make out, for a mere unity cannot manifest. Therefore the immense travail of thought, and the turning and turning about. Because of this, the *Purāṇas* find it so difficult to decide precedence between the Trinity, especially, Shiva and Viṣhṇu. शिवस्य हृदयं विष्णुर्विष्णोश्च हृदयं शिवः । and Brahmā is now the father and now the son, etc., of either of the other, the three corresponding to time, space and motion.

implies non-simultaneity, non-oneness. A n ṭ a h, 'within', 'inner', is equivalent to, or implies a n ṭ a r a or interval. Hence m a n a s cannot apprehend things simultaneously, as one, but does so in succession, as separate. But, on the other hand, simultaneity or oneness is also in the S v a-b h ā v a, and S v a-b h ā v a and 'I' are not separate but one and the same; therefore the *whole* I-ness of the I is b u ḍ ḍ h i whereby simultaneity of cognition (knowledge of many things as parts of one and as one, *i.e.*, as strung together by the I-ness, the unity, of the I into an unbroken continuance) arises.[1] The appearance

[1] The reader who is familiar with theosophical views as to the seven principles of man, the permanent atoms, the nature of the mental and buḍḍhic atoms, the buḍḍhic web of life, the gradual transfer of the centre of consciousness from one plane and body to another, the limitation or expansion of consciousness by such transfer, the lower concrete mind with m a n a s attached to k ā m a, the higher abstract mind with m a n a s attached to b u ḍ ḍ h i, the monadic triad of ā ṭ m a-b u ḍ ḍ h i-m a n a s (at present connected with the three planes of ā k ā s h a, v ā y u-a g n i), to be later located in a n u p ā ḍ a k a-ā k ā s h a-v ā y u, and then again in ā ḍ i-a n u p ā-ḍ a k a-ā k ā s h a, etc., etc.,—will find much suggestion for thought and explanation of 'whys' in the text here.

of simultaneity or unity in that which is not synchronous or one is b u ḍ ḍ h i, as the *Nyāya* says. On the foundations of these, space, time, m a n a s (standing for m a h a ṭ) and b u ḍ ḍ h i, is the whole world built.

Out of and in these all the various substances and qualities arise successively one out of another. Thus 'I-this-sound-not' is a complete logion. In this there takes places the y o g a-v i b h ā g a, conjunction-division, varied combination, of the nature of 'sound-not-I' (?). Because of this there appears p r a y a ṭ n a, effort, volition, in the Self. And because of the effort, there arise a n u-v a r ṭ a n a and p a r i-v a r ṭ a n a, persistence and change, permutations and combinations (in the atoms ?). The result of this is, finally, that v ā y u arises as the carrier or vehicle of sound. And the quality of sound itself, at the time of spreading forth or being 'carried,' becomes transformed into the quality of touch, by the s p a n ḍ a or vibration of sound. So out of the vibration of touch, visibility; and so, successively, taste and smell.[1]

It seems that what is here called b u ḍ ḍ h i and m a h a ṭ (m a n a s) is called m a h a ṭ and a h a ṅ k ā r a in the current *Sāṅkhya*.

[1] Metaphysics and physics are obviously brought very close together here. One almost feels that the long-sought goal of "reducing to psychical elements,

The s p a n ḍ a or vibration from which, and the substance by the vibration of which, something new results, a new substance or a new

---

all physical phenomena" (Max Verworn, *General Physiology*, p. 38, translated by Lee) has been reached. But it is a case of only 'feeling,' and there too 'almost.' The break of the connecting tradition makes it nearly impossible to understand clearly the sentences of the text. It is only the modern ideas of science and the views of Theosophy that help one to make 'guesses at the true meaning' in such elusive portions of the work, which, by reaction, help one to understand the 'whys' of Theosophy and science better. It is a case of mutual help.

The changes rung here, on the words of the primary logion, in order to deduce from it all psychical and physical phenomena are very subtle and I have, no doubt, often failed to catch and reproduce the true meaning of the author. I can only hope that some reader, more richly endowed with intuition and the b u ḍ ḍ h i which sees the unity in the diversity, may be more fortunate in fixing the true sense.

As to the successive development of the ḍ r a v y a s and g u ṇ a s one out of another, the metaphysical deduction may be put as below, as one way: In seeking (from the empirical standpoint of the successive) to define to itself 'What am I?' the Self dons a veil of that most tenuous and filmy matter

quality—we have a duality here, *viz.*, the previous vibration and the product of the vibration. Avasṭhā, condition, state, comes from or arises out of vibration and from vibration arises the succession of two, three, four, etc. Therefore is it said that all is produced by vibration.

---

which may be called ādi-ṭaṭṭva possessed of the quality of mere 'configuration,' 'geometrical' or archetypal forms, the next remove after the first pure mere 'objectivity' or 'this-ness' of Mūla-prakṛṭi. But 'almost' simultaneously with this identification of the I with *a film*, the need for a contradistinguishing 'this' appears. Nothing can be determined without something else from which it is to be distinguished. Therefore the anupādaka-ṭaṭṭva appears as a foil, the reticulation in the plasm. But yet again a connecting link, by the medium of which the two may be held in contradistinction and yet connexion or juxtaposition, is wanted. Therefore ākāsha appears as manas or ahaṅkāra; as nucleus amidst plasm and reticulation. So we have āṭmā-buḍḍhi-manas. And each successive appearance must be, can only be, *out* of the previous one, by a differentiation a 'heterisation,' 'othering.' And so the gradual descent of the 'triplet,' and a corresponding ascent. By another necessity, each previous plane needs, produces and uses the next one as a carrier or vehicle, just as the soul needs a body. See the *Science of Peace*, p. 295, 296 and footnote in Sec. VI, *infra*.

Vibration arises in ākāsha because of the presence of the Self in it; and it does so under a fixed law that such a vibration shall take place in such a ṭruṭi or moment (a definite measure of time), or from such a moment to such a moment. There is also another law, *viz.*, that this is the avasṭhā, condition, limitation, of this and this vibration, in such and such a manner (?), and again, anavasṭhā, absence of finality or definition by means of such (another) vibration.[1]

The universality of vibration has been declared everywhere. As the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: Vibration only is the manifestation of kriyā, action. And therefore is it said in the Science of Grammar: Such a shabḍa, sound, is produced by such and so much of a vibration. The number of vibrations is the principle or secret of

[1] The presence of the Self causes vibration, through prayaṭna, as explained above, a little while ago. The periodicity of vibrations is obvious. The next very vague sentence seems to mean that any particular substance retains its definite nature only so long as the atoms concerned are vibrating in a particular manner, and that when they begin to vibrate in a certain other manner, it loses its definiteness and the whole mass of it passes into the so-called 'critical' stage intervening between two definite forms.

the production of all sounds. By so much vibration we have ḍ h v a n i, inarticulate sound; by so much s p a s h t a, articulate, clear; by so much their u p a n y ā s a, juxtaposition, composition, collocation, placing and spreading out one near and after another (?). This very vibration, when it takes place in the pronunciation of letters, *i.e.*, human speech, is called p r a y a ṭ n a, (the technical 'vocal effort' of Saṃskṛṭ grammar). As the *Shikṣhā* says: P r a y a ṭ n a is the vibration of the k a m a l a, 'lotus,' nerve-plexus, (the a r ṇ i k ā-plexuses mentioned before). As is the vibration of the k a m a l a, rapid or slow, such is the quality of the sound, sweet, soft, harsh, etc. Because of the a l p a ṭ v a, fewness, smallness, finer or subtler quality, of the atoms used in the formation of the bodies of women and the greater rapidity of the vibrations of their k a m a l a, and the greater (number or range of) s h a b ḍ a-s p a n ḍ a, sound-vibrations, the feminine voice is generally soft-toned. Of course there are many women too whose voices are not soft; in their case the vibrations are not rapid (enough). The voices of children may be usefully studied in this connexion, for a clearer knowledge of the vibrations of sound.

SECTION III (*Continued*).

CHAPTER XXXVI.

LOVE AND HATE.

The pair of Love and Hate as the 'ethical' form of the primal 'metaphysical' pair of Self and Not-Self, and the 'psychical' form of the 'physical' pair of harmonious and discordant vibration.—Musical vibrations and emotions.—Harmonisation of thoughts and emotions, in science and poetry, and the opposite, considered as wise use and unwise waste of time.—Science and literature in terms of Love and Hate.—The motifs and ornamental figures of rhetoric and poetry in the same terms.—The inference and analogies of science in the same.—The three chief figures of speech.—The three chief motifs of poetry.—Sub-divisions.—Music in terms of the emotions.—Its factors.—Pleasure and pain as co-efficients of expansive and contractive vibration.—Genesis of kinds of matter out of kinds of emotion.—The reverse process of reabsorption by cessation of emotion.—The meaning of Laya.—Application to Yoga.—Laya as samāḍhi.—Sleep as one form of it.—Deeper and deeper samāḍhis and higher and higher manifestations *ad infinitum*.—The Eternal and Transcendent.

At the end of the last chapter the physiology of human vocal vibrations was touched upon.

We may make a few observations here as to the emotional psychology of sound-vibrations. Appropriate vibrations of sound make music. Fine music, full of poetic unction, arouses love and other sentiments. Whence the current proverb that the time of the intelligent, d h ī-m ā n, is spent in the pleasures and harmonies of poetry and science, while that of the witless is wasted in sleep or in discord.

Ḍ h ī, intelligence, is b u ḍ ḍ h i, the power or faculty of p a r i-b h ā v a n a, 'revolving in mind,' 'realising on all sides,' thinking, reflecting. He only can judge all affairs rightly who has this power. And all thinking is concerned with 'three' things only, for the Trinity is all and all-inclusive and there is nothing left outside of it. Also, b u ḍ ḍ h i, as repeatedly pointed out before, is the power of 'simultaneous cognition,' of connecting together diverse things in a unity. Therefore he alone is ḍ h ī-m ā n, truly wise and intelligent, whose thinking ever unifies and reconciles and harmonises the many and the diverse. And such persons necessarily always pass their time in poetry and science, which ever seek unity in diversity.

How does poetry answer to this characterisation? Thus: K ā v y a-s h ā s ṭ r a, poetry or the science of poetry, deals with b h ā v a, emotion. And emotion, b h ā v a (emotional mood or mode

of existence) is a form of k r i y ā, action. And action depends on cognition and desire. And they are all interdependent and one. The feeling of this unity (by unifying oneself with the characters of the poem and living their life mentally in respect of all these, cognition, desire and action) is the essence of the enjoyment mentioned. (If we interpret kā v y a-s h ā s-ṭ r a as 'poetry and science,' then too the explanation is this: in the case of poetry the unification and harmonisation is two-fold, (*a*) that of the thoughts, feeling and deeds of each character, *i.e.*, the consistency between them and (*b*) that of the reader with the character; and so in the case of works of science also, the unification is two-fold, (*a*) the tracing of one common law in diverse facts and events and (*b*) of the reader with the writer, by acceptance of the latter's knowledge and experience and their conclusions.)

Time so passed in literary and scientific pursuits is called 'good (or well-spent)' time. But why? When all time is a matter of necessity, and necessity is S v a-b h ā v a, and S v a-b h ā v a is B r a h m a n, should not all times be regarded as similar, all equally well-spent or ill-spent? No, because like all other necessities, the distinction between good time and bad time is also necessary.

Shāsṭra, science, of the nature of kāvya,[1] poetry, is kāvya-shāsṭra. The praṭi-smaraṇa, the re-recollection, the counter-recollection, the reflexion in the mind of another, of bhāva, emotion, is poetry.[2] And emotion follows on, or is the experiencing of, or is experienced through, or is some transformation or other, of rāga and ḍveṣha, love and hate. Hence the *Sāhiṭya*-aphorism: Bhāva is two-fold, (*a*) born of love and (*b*) born of hate. These two are present, as subdivisions, in desire. And desire is connected with cognition on the one hand and action on the other. Now these, cognition and action are, or cognitive action is, reflected in desire. And this reflexion itself is the emotion of love or hate.[3] In other words, Self and Not-Self, acting, moving within, or inspiring Desire, respectively take on the nature of and appear transformed as Love and Hate. (This is the ethical aspect of the Primal Pair of which the cognitional aspect is Spirit and Matter or

[1] Kāvya does not necessarily mean verse only. Gaḍya-kāvya is prose-poems; paḍya-kāvya is verse-poems. Kāvya would perhaps be best defined as "life-creation in words." The Primal Kavi or Poet is Brahmā, the Author of this world-system.

[2] See *The Science of the Emotions*, ch. x.

[3] *Ibid*. ch. iv.

Subject and Object, and the practical or actional aspect, spanḍa and sphuraṇa, action and reaction, the inspiration and expiration of the Great Breath[1]).

All and everything "becomes," *i.e.*, is produced by desire. And (etymologically) bhāva, (from the root bhū, to be) is 'becoming.' Therefore, desire, tending to produce action, contains or becomes emotion. Because of these considerations, the *Brahma-sūṭra* says: The anu-varṇana, 'after- or close description,' depiction, of love and hate (war) is poetry.

We have seen before that love appears in the mind whenever the (unity of the) I is felt strongly; hate when the manyness of the This (the separative body) is the predominant feeling; and peace, indifference, impartiality, sleep and silence, when the feeling of Negation prevails. The 'recollection' of these two, love and hate, mixed with a sense of effort, of activity, a tendency to act, is emotion. And the depiction of emotion, for the purpose of putting another in mind of it, is poetry. This depiction is of the nature of praṭi-kriyā, reaction.

The current definition of poetry in *Sāhiṭya*, the Science of Poetry, Rhetoric and Literature, generally, is "rasa-inspired, sentiment-embodying, language." But this is quite in

---

[1] See *The Secret Doctrine*, Vol. I, p. 11 (Old Ed.)

accord with the definition given above, for r a s a is entirely a matter of b h ā v a. In fact "the dwelling in mind on some b h ā v a is r a s a."[1]

Kāvya is concerned with action, active manifestation of emotion; *Sāhiṭya* with cognition, with understanding of the laws and principles underlying such manifestation. (They are as Language and Grammar). The absence of both is illiteracy, ignorance, indifference, for verily the Self is neither *Kāvya* nor *Sāhiṭya.*

The science of *Sāhiṭya* describes the origin of all emotions, their ā b h ā s a, reflexion, imitation, simulation, the different names and forms of love and hate, and their definite and indefinite aspects and conditions. This (*Sāhiṭya*) is also known as a l a ṅ-k ā r a. The *Sāhiṭya-Sūṭra* says: The a v a s ṭ h ā, condition, state, mood, of r ā g a and ḍ v e ṣ h a, love and hate, is a l a ṅ-k ā r a, 'fulfilment,' that which makes full or enough (a l a m), perfects, completes, hence ornament, figure of speech, rhetoric.

---

[1] भावस्मरणं रसः. R a s a means juice, sap, tasteful liquid, taste, etc. And literally, as the secretion of salivary, gastric and other digestive juices follows on the contact of edibles, on the physical plane, so, on the superphysical plane, there are corresponding secretions on the arising of emotions and the dwelling on them. Indeed, these have physical reactions also and breed toxins, etc.

Alam, enough, adequate, remarkable, prominent, manifest, is bhūṣhaṇa, ornament. Therefore the anu-varḍhana, development, intensification, of love and hate, is alaṅ-kāra, ornament of speech. For, as the *Nyāya* declares, avasṭhā, condition or state, is defined and made manifest by anu-varḍhana and praṭi-varḍhana, increase and counter-increase, that is to say, the successive intensification of two opposites, in the way of action and reaction.

The main factors of alaṅk-āra, figure of speech, as illustrated in that primary figure, the simile, are three: the upamāna or 'resemblant,' the upameya or 'resembled,' and the an-anya or 'not other,' *i.e.*, the identity or 'resemblance,' the common feature.

Reading one thing into another in the pursuit of unity is simili-fication, upa-māna, 'measuring close up, near, by the same measure.' (The word means the resemblant, the analogue, the standard of comparison, as also the act of comparing). In the words of the *Nyāya*: The supporting or proving of a thesis by means of a generally recognised commonness of characteristic is upa-māna, proof by analogy. Here, the characteristic in the sāḍhya, 'the thesis to be proved,' is the 'resembled' or upa-meya; and that in the analogue

or sāḍhana, 'the means of proving,' is the resemblant or upa-māna. These two are interdependent, and, together with the third, *viz.*, 'identity or resemblance,' complete, perfect and embellish everything. But are not these two, resembled and resemblant, literally identical? Are they not *one* characteristic? Yes, they are identical, but with this difference that one and the same characteristic is attached to two different individuals who have other characteristics also which differ. No simile is complete in every respect. Thus, when we speak of the moon-faced maid, we, obviously, do not mean that all the characteristics of the one are present in the other, but only a few.

'Moon-faced maiden' is an instance of upa-mān-ālaṅkāra, (that variety of simile in which the upa-māna and upa-meya change places, so to say, in respect of importance). Here the moon has become the upa-meya, and the face the upa-māna. The significance of the simile is that the great soft radiance and glory of the moon (as the Self) is present in the lesser lustre of the face (as the jīva).

An instance of upa-mey-ālaṅkāra is:
Thy face is one pure light, the Moon has stains,
'Tis ever full, the moon waxes and wanes.

The notion here is that while, from one standpoint, one thing looms larger than another, from

another standpoint, the latter overshadows the former; that in every smaller there is the possibility of a greater greatness than that of its apparent superior—all being, in the ultimate reality, equal and indeed One.

An instance of a n a n y-ā l a ṅ k ā r a (metaphor) is the expression: 'The boy is a lion.' The main characteristic, of courage, being mainly considered here as the most important, and all the other circumstances unimportant and therefore to be ignored, the differences between a boy and a lion are neglected and the two are identified.

The summation of these is a ṭ i s h a y-o k ṭ i, 'excessive speech,' hyperbole, exaggeration.

By permutations and combinations of these, we obtain one hundred and eight figures of speech, and then a countless number, the details of which may be studied in the treatises on *Sāhiṭya*.

An a l a ṅ k ā r a lights up, throws into relief, a r a s a. Hence the view that "choice language is k ā v y a, poetry." Hence, too, the further statement that the ā v a r ṭ a n a, the turning round and round, revolving, of a r a s a, an emotion, a sentiment, is a l a ṅ k ā r a. R a s a is the succession or flow of emotion, deliberately 'tasted,' emotion being always of the nature of love or hate. As the aphorism puts it, in

other words: The karma, order, succession, stream, flow, that there is in bhāva, emotion—that is alaṅkāra. The recollection and remembrance, the holding in memory of an emotion—this after this, etc.—such is the form of rasa. The *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: The continuous recollection of, the dwelling in memory on, a previously experienced emotion, is rasa.

The principal rasas are three: (i) Shṛṅgāra, the erotic, (ii) Rauḍra, the wrathful, (iii) Shānṭa, the peaceful. The three respectively correspond to (i) Love, (ii) Hate and (iii) reposeful Peace, calm and impartial indifference; also, to cognition, action and desire, respectively. It may be queried that desire is the reverse of peacefulness; the reply is that the fulfilment of desire is by necessity, and that (the realisation of the necessity of everything, after the fulfilment of the dual desire of pursuit and renunciation) is Peace. The pleasance of the I, the realisation of it, is shṛṅgāra, (wherein the whole being expands and grows 'tall with pride,' pleasure, self-feeling, shṛṅga meaning 'peak,' 'horn,' etc.). The realisation of the opposite of the self, of another 'this' as separate and exclusive, is rauḍra (that which leads to 'howling' and 'crying' by loss and contraction, from ruḍ, to cry). The 'subsidence' of both, their mergence into one, is shānṭa (from sham, to subside

and become quiet), which belongs to Brahman. Brahman can be described in it and by it only.

Subdivisions of these three principal poetic sentiments, unctions, interests, motifs, relishes, yield the known nine; and further subdivisions and permutations and combinations, a countless number, as with the figures of speech. And they are rendered by tone, word, prose and verse in kāvya or literature generally.

Because figures of speech are connected with poetic sentiment, that with emotion, that with action, and that with vibration, therefore are these all dealt with here.

This itself (or an elaboration or transformation of this) is called sāṅgīṭa,[1] music. Making a praṭi-shabḍa to a shabḍa, echoing sound with sound, is music. All kinds of actions take place in the world; and all kinds of emotions arise in connexion with them; the reiterated expression of these same emotions in the appropriate times and circumstances, in other words, the anu-vachana, the 'translation' of them into sounds, in the way of or under the governance of the spirit of reaction or reverberation (the praṭi-kriyā or reaction of knowledge being speech, as described before)—this is music, as the musicians declare.

---

[1] The modern form is saṅgīṭa.

The subdivisions or kinds of music are many. The (six and) thirty-six rāgas and rāgiṇis[1] are well known; their subdivisions are infinite and in their endless echo and re-echo establish and confirm and show forth the infinite continuum of cognition and its subdivisions of recollections and re-recollections over and over again.

All this also is dependent on sound and manifested by vibration. Pleasantness and unpleasantness are also dependent on spanḍa and sphuraṇa, expansive and contractile vibration, relief and strain, prevalence and resistance, advance and retreat. For what is felt as musically harmonious and pleasant at one time and place becomes otherwise elsewhere and in another moment; that is to say, unpleasantness corresponds with the moment of sphuraṇa (in one's own being) and pleasantness with that of spanḍa. (That is to say, the vibratory state of the physical and mental sheaths of the listener changes from time to time, place to place, circumstance to circumstance. To each state corresponds an appropriate rāga, etc., which will help on spanḍa, expansion, in the sheaths of the listener; whereas an

---

[1] Musical modes or orders of sound; generally, one may say, what metres are in poetry, that rāgas and rāgiṇis are in music.

inappropriate one will cause s p h u r a ṇ a, a sense of contraction and strain and disharmony. This is why it is declared that a certain r ā g a is appropriate to the morning, another to the noon, another to the evening, another to spring, another to summer, another to the rain-time, another to youth, another to prime, another to old age, another to love, another to war, another to peace, another to joy, another to sorrow, another to resignation and renunciation—and so on, endlessly).

It[1] is true that the s a ṭ ṭ ā, the being and potency of sound exists all along in ā k ā s h a;

[1] The transition looks abrupt. The idea probably is first to show that emotion makes music and music creates conditions and things, and, successively, all the details of the world as known to us; in other words to show that the psychical is the heart of the physical, emotion the cause of creation. In the words of the mystics and Sūfis, God felt defect, He was dicontented with His loneliness, the One without a second wanted a second for companion, Spirit put on the veil of Matter, Purusha took Prakṛṭi into His arms, the j ī v a identified itself with an assumed atom, B r a h m a n dreamed M ā y ā-dreams, P r a ṭ y a g ā ṭ m ā married M ū l a-p r a k ṛ ṭ i in a fit of a-v i ḍ y ā, God created creatures that they might praise His glory and He thus realise it Himself, and so on—the first manifestations being in terms of ā k ā s h a and musical sound.

still its specification, its definite manifestation as sound, depends on s p a n ḍ a, vibration. And by a further modification of these vibrations of sound, arises touch.

To illustrate the endlessly multifarious conditions or variations of sound, we have instanced poetry and music above. Indeed, all difference of a v a s ṭ h ā, state, condition, nature, is difference of vibration (from one point of view). These vibrations which constitute sound and the other qualities, may be perceived by yoga-practice.

We have just said that touch arises out of sound. How is this? See. People come near when called, and then results mutual contact. It may be said that s p a r s h a, touch, often takes place without any calling up or any special relationship; yet it may be noticed that we ordinarily 'touch' only those with whom we have some relationship, some connexion by s v a-b h ā v a, by nature. Further, as is the relationship, such is the quality of the touch, with subtle differences. Metaphysically, it is true that everything is in 'touch' with everything else, generally; yet, in the realm of the successive, contacts are specific and governed by special laws. We are in relations, of some sort or other, with all persons; but we have no occasion to 'touch' them all; only the more

important and close relations, brother, spouse, child, etc. Yet more, our way of touching, speaking to, dealing with, each is different.

Because[1] of this, touch is the quality of the ḍ r a v y a or substance known as v ā y u. Proof whereof is this:

---

[1] This 'because,' and all the context, is rather difficult to follow. Indeed, the previous paragraph must have appeared rather inconsequent to the reader. That touch arises out of sound because people come to us to be touched when we call them—does not very readily appeal to the intelligence! Yet it is perfectly in keeping with the whole character of the work, which is to interpret the physical in terms of the psychical, to understand the unconscious by the conscious, to reduce science into metaphysic, to see in all the workings of so-called inanimate nature the one Power of the Spirit. Sound, touch, etc., are after all, *psychical* phenomena, essentially; and the movements of atoms are not the vibrations of dead things, but the thrillings of matter intensely alive. What appears as inanimate attraction and repulsion is in reality very animate love and hate. If human beings call to and approach and contact each other for psychical reasons, of affection, etc., so too do atoms. The various relationships of the former indicate growing "nearness," "closeness of connexion"; so too, on the law of analogy and psycho-physical parallelism, does the passing of sound into touch, betoken a growing 'intensity' and 'closeness' of

Ākāsha is as emptiness; and the svabhāva or characteristic that is present therein,[1] of pra-charaṇa, motion, moving about—that

---

vibration and mutual relationship amongst atoms. The subdivisions of one sensation (say color) and its corresponding substance aṇi can be ranged on one harmonically progressive scale and are seen to be cognisable by subdivisional parts of the same organ (the retina). From a wider standpoint, all sensations, all substances, all sense-organs can be ranged on one—a vaster—harmonically progressive scale. (See *The Science of Peace*, chs. xiv-xv.) It is only the old, old story of the one and the many; a higher and higher unity and a lower and lower multiplicity, endlessly. Metals and non-metals, hardest solids and rarest gases are seen to occupy successive places on the same continuous periodic table of elements in modern Chemistry. Metaphysically, the law of the arrangement covers and includes all psycho-physical phenomena whatsoever.

[1] As its opposite, as well as its continuation Everything carries its opposite within itself, which opposite is yet a continuation of it. The reversed image of a man standing on the edge of a sheet of water is his opposite as well as continuation. So the cones of light-rays on the two sides of a pin-hole. So Self and Not-Self. So subtler and denser planes of matter. So, in one aspect the inner and outer sheaths, sharīras. See *The Science of Peace*, p. 295.

is vāyu; and it is manifested by the vibrations of ākāsha, and 'spreads out' all things; and because touch is also a matter of similar prasāraṇa or 'spreading out,' therefore is it (identified as) the quality of vāyu. Hence, too, is sound the object of the ear and touch of the skin; for there is an immediate connexion between the ear and the skin, shroṭra and ṭwak, as there is between ākāsha and vāyu.

So again, the vibrations of touch give rise to rūpa, appearance, visible form. Touch is definite only when the object of it has a visible shape also. The subtler and vaguer the visibility, the less the possibility of distinct touch. (Normally, things invisible are tangible only indistinctly, like the air. The definition of tangibility is the passing into visibility.) It is true that the sūkṣhma, liṅga, and kāraṇa bodies may also be touched, or may feel and cognise tacts; but (that is a matter of relativity between cogniser and cognised, *i.e.*, those bodies can touch and be touched by corresponding matter of the same planes, and moreover), in that way, indeed, everything whatever in the world may be touched and heard and seen (provided the requisite subtler senses are available). And all this is an affair of vibration. "As is the spanḍa so does (the substance)

become," says the *Brahma-Sūṭra*. And again: From one kind of expansive and contractive vibration, s p a n ḍ a and s p h u r a ṇ a, is born one (kind of substance). (In other words, the same root-matter, M ū l a-p r a k ṛ ṭ i, in different kinds of vibrations, appears as different substances, with different sense-qualities).

From the vibrations of r ū p a, there is born taste, which can be felt only when visible shape is definitely present already.

Finally, from the vibrations of taste, is born smell. In each one is included the 'experience' of another. (? Also, each one of the sensations of any one sense has a specifically corresponding sensation belonging to each one of the other senses, *e.g.*, sweet smell, sweet taste, sweet appearance, sweet touch, sweet sound). Medical science (in the department of Chemistry) tells us how such and such an odour may be produced out of such and such a taste belonging to such and such a substance.

The sense-qualities belong to their respective substances and sense-organs, universally. (The same vibrations of the same atom will constitute the same substance, and will produce the same sensation in or on the receiving organs constituted in the same way, in any time and any space. In other words, given the same constitution of sense-organ, and of the vibrating

atom, the resultant sensation experienced will be the same, in all times and all spaces).

The well-known quintuplication, pañchī karaṇa,[1] of the elements, has arisen in this wise. When the less known two other elements become manifest, then saptī-karaṇa or septuplication will be generally recognised.

By the 'conquest' of this sense-multiplication, this innate tendency to evolve new sense-qualities, substances, sense-organs, etc., laya is secured. 'Conquest' here means abolition, annihilation. It is true that complete annihilation of anything is not possible. Yet at the same time we see that laya is a constant and unignorable fact also—in the way of inaction, sleep, by means of the Negation. It is ever present in the Logion. The condition *between* I and This is laya, dissolution, reabsorption, the point of neutrality wherein both factors become concealed. It is also the condition *between* This and Not, and *between* Not and I;

---

[1] In current *Veḍānṭa* works, this word means that at the present stage of our evolution these five elements exist for us united in a definite proportion, a moiety of each (giving the name) plus one-quarter of the other half consisting of each of the other four. But here the word seems to mean simply the 'becoming or making five' of what was the one root-matter.

and the Negation itself is laya. This laya is a matter of, or preliminary to, and intervenes before every successive new connexion and manifestation.[1]

Laya is the whole secret and essence of nish-kriyā. The manifestation, in the successive world-process, of the Negation (of all particulars, of all This, of all this's) existing in Brahman is laya. With reference to the indriyas, the organs of sensation and action, this same laya is called samāḍhi, as described by the science of Yoga. By the nirodha, inhibition of the kāryas, functionings,

[1] Compare the laya-centre of *The Secret Doctrine*, its omnipresence, in a metaphysical sense, and location *between* two planes of matter and two states of consciousness, etc., in a superphysical sense. All details are ever present in the seed of the laya-point, and all new manifestations begin with a dive into it of the jīva. Dreams begin after a moment of laya from the waking consciousness. If that laya-point can be bridged over by yoga-meditations, then for that individual the two planes run into one and become as one continuous jāgraṭ. Laya is the true chaos in the womb of which all cosmos exists ever, from which desire or will may draw out anything at any time, at any place, if it is earnest enough, that earnestness itself being governed by the chaos! See *Yoga-sūṭra*, iv.

of the indṛiyas, organs, there results samādhi.

But is not such inhibition improper, seeing the functionings are svabhāva-siḍḍha, nature-ordained? (But so is the inhibition). The withdrawal of one's consciousness, sva-saṭṭā, one's own being, the being of one's own self, the support given to the functioning, by the *attention* of the self, from that functioning is the inhibition; and the ideation, ava-ḍhāraṇa, the holding in concentration, of that sva-saṭṭā, self-being, self-consciousness, in one's own self, the realisation of one's self as space-less, timeless, actionless, changeless—this is samāḍhi-proper.

This inhibition is again a matter of succession and graduation. After the inhibition of the sense of smell, comes that of taste; then of vision and so on, in successive retrogression and reabsorption, in the inversed order of the manifestation. On the inhibition of these five senses, (because of the exhibitive tendency of the consciousness, during the time of cyclic manifestation, forcing itself into new directions, as dammed-up currents break out into other channels) there results the development of the unknown organs of sense and action, whereby are acquired many kinds of powers and 'perfections'. On inhibiting and passing beyond

these also, the condition of Saṭ-Chiḍ-Ānanḍa is attained.

But why stop short with these seven? There are countless beyonds after beyonds. True, but within a limited cycle of the successive, there will always be found a final superlative; while from the standpoint of the Universal, indeed, all jīvas are already perfect yogīs, and are ever engaged in serving each other and all beings (consciously or unconsciously), that is to say, they are serving only them-Self in endless forms.

Sleep is only an imitation of this samāḍhi-laya. The gross physical body is abandoned during sleep also, and the vṛṭṭis, moods and modes, are also inhibited. Pralaya, Mahālaya, Mahā-pralaya are all varieties of laya, graded in a series according to the grades and extents of the I, the This and the Not (in their concrete, limited, specialised and cyclic aspect) between which they intervene.

The excellence, the merit and virtue, of samāḍhi is that it enables us to realise the unity, the interdependence, the mutual service of all selves, as mentioned just before. He who has realised the secret of this interdependence of all creatures,—he knows that praise is blame and blame is praise, (because while the one is given for helping and the other for hindering, yet helping one is hindering another and *vice versa*)

he sees sin in merit and merit in sin, (because sin is causing pain and merit is giving pleasure, and giving to one is taking from another and *vice versa*); he understands that sorrow and punishment come unfailingly to the sinner, because in giving pain to another, he has hurt himself, the one Self; he recognises clearly that the reward of joy comes inevitably to the meritorious, because his act of merit is a gift, not to another, but to him-Self; (and *looking* at the World-Process as a Whole thus, with the *Transcendental* vision, yet, in the cyclic part he is dealing with, *practically*, in the given time, space and circumstances, he resolutely helps one and hinders another, as the duty of the moment requires, avoids the deed that is sin in the given conditions, strenuously pursues the act that is merit then, is willing to suffer praise for the one, anxious to avoid the blame of doing the other).

I am not substance, nor am attribute,
Nor movement, nor concerned with proof, disproof,
Object of proof, or doubt or fallacy;
I am not sense, nor quality of sense,
Nor bṛhan-mānasa, nor hṛt, nor ear,
Nor am I skin or eye or tongue or nose,
Nor sound, nor touch, nor visibility,
Nor taste, nor odor, varied endlessly;

Nor am I the first ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a that was born
In this world-egg, nor yet the second, that
Which yet hath no sense-organ to receive it;
I am not subtle ether, nor yet fire,
Nor air, nor water, nor the fragrant earth;
Nor septenate, nor pentad; nor am I
Inhabitant of gross or subtle worlds;
Nor have I any interest in pulls
And pushes, violent reliefs and strains,
Vibrations, linear, rotary, oscillant,
Swellings and shrinkings, breathings in and
out;
Nor loves and hates, nor muse of song or verse;
I have not aught to do with y o g a-labor;
There is none else to whom I may be yoked,
Joined or disjoined; I cannot be educed,
Reduced, evolved, involved, or made to change;
I need no inhibition of one sense
To exhibit another latent one;
Nor action nor reaction do I need,
Nor restless motion, nor yet moveless rest,
Nor l a y a nor v i k ṣ h e p a, sleep distraught—
For I am all at once, yea, all at once,
All is within Me and I am in all,
A constant motion in Eternal Rest.

SECTION IV.

Sṛshty-aika-deshika-prakaraṇa

ONE PART OUT OF THE CONTINUUM OF WORLD-SYSTEMS.

The co-ordination and general similarity in diversity of all planes, systems, worlds, individuals. —The peculiar features of our world-system.—Our sevenfold evolution.—Mineral, vegetable, animal, chanḍrāṭmā, saurāṭmā, abhyāṭmā, and human.—Metaphysical laws guiding these.—The appearance of Karma at the human stage.—The distinction between mechanical or automatic action and deliberate action initiated by free-will.—Sâmya and vaishamya, equality and inequality, homogeneity and differentiation, as the meaning of evolution.—Difference of proportion of I and This in the different kingdoms.—Their balancing in the human.—The comparative nature of all such statements.—Endless sub-divisions within each kingdom.—Seven main sub-divisions of each.—Intercourse between the three subtler and the four grosser kingdoms.—Its special conditions.—The mutual subservience of all the kingdoms.—Illustrations from Mineralogy, Botany, Medicine, Physical Science.—Subservience due to natural affinities and disparities.—Sciences sub-divided into internal and external, theory and practice, science and art.—

Illustration of sub-divisions of types from the case of color.—Changes and correspondences of color.—Use of the science of color in the Science of Love.—The underlying laws of emotion, as applicable to all other forms of manifestation.—The root-emotions, Love and Hate.—The poetical sentiments arising out of them.—The nine poetical sentiments, (in three triplets).—The metaphysic of the relation between substance, sense-quality and vibration.—Some facts relating to the mineral and the ḍ e v a-kingdoms.—The human kingdom the summation of the other six.—The degrees of the sense of personality.—The seven sheaths of the human being.—The nature of these.—The metaphysical reason thereof.—The moral of the tale.

We have now to endeavor to understand the synthesis and continuum that ever subsists between all worlds, systems, planes, creations whatsoever. Of course, this also, like all things else is included in the Logion. Because the Unity pervades and permeates all the Many, therefore no piece of the latter can be wholly dissociated from any other piece. (The fact of this Unity governing the Multiplicity, manifests as Law, the law of Analogy, of Relativity, of Similarity in Diversity, of Correspondences, of Causation, of Action and Reaction, and all other laws; it is the principle of all generalisations and universal rules, and of the interweaving and interdependence of all things of all planes

whatsoever). Without the knowledge of this multi-Unity of B r a h m a n, correct knowledge of the countless emanations within It, and of their co-ordination, is not possible. And without correct knowledge, correct action is not possible. Hence the need to realise the Ultimate and the Penultimate Universals. So only can the pseudo-infinite particulars be grasped effectively, and marshalled in their due order and proportion (deductively, thereby obviating endless doubt and questioning). So only can we realise that all kinds of experiences, cognitions, desires, actions, are passed through by all and every manifested j ī v a ; that all the worlds and planes behave similarly, in a general way ; that all Life and all lives is and are really One Life.

Here (in this world-system) we find four kinds of creation laid down : (i) arising out of two elements of 'This'; (ii) out of two elements of 'This-Not'; (iii) out of two elements of Not-I; and (iv) out of one element of I-This-Not (?) [1]

---

[1] This statement is wholly dark. Subsequent statements indicate that it perhaps refers, with regard to their constitution in terms of the factors of the Logion and corresponding s a ṭ ṭ v a, r a j a s, ṭ a m a s, to the four kingdoms of our physical earth, mineral, vegetable, animal, and human. They may also refer to four planes of matter, *vide* succeeding paras.

But really all exists in each. Our world-system is said to be sevenfold, (consisting of seven planes), mainly because (and in imitation) of the two triplets of substance, attribute, movement (and cognition, desire, action) and their summation. But, indeed, creation is infinitefold, and not only threefold or fivefold or sevenfold. (Only within given limits of space and time, may we say that any given cycle and system deals with a given number of planes, etc.)

Evolution in our own world-system is sevenfold, as just said, in the way of gross and subtle (planes or grades and kinds of matter) representing combinations of elements of This and I; (*i.e.*, the grosser or denser planes, representing the This more prominently and the subtler ones the I; in other words, forming the body and the soul, the vehicle and the mind, the sheath and the consciousness etc.)[1] Of these, four are well-known, three less-known. But these three may also be 'experienced' or felt by or in thought. Of the four well-known, three again are more familiar still. In these the element of This, objectivity, externality, materiality, predominates. So in the less-known three, the element of I, subjectivity,

[1] See *The Science of Peace*, ch. xiii, p. 210 and ch. xv, pp. 291, 296.

innerness, spirituality, prevails. Yet it is all a matter of gradation and succession; the gross arises out of the subtle and *vice versa*.

The six kingdoms or creations are mineral, vegetable, animal, c h a n d r ā ṭ m ā, s a u r ā ṭ m ā and a b h y ā ṭ m ā.[1] There have been other evolutions also, by sevens and threes, but they are not mentioned because much too subtle. They are described in the *Shākhās* of the *Vedas*. Here, in a brief general survey of the contents of the *Praṇava*, we need consider only the more familiar; and of these, the minerals offer themselves first for treatment, as E ṭ a ṭ predominates in their being; and E ṭ a ṭ corresponds to action *i.e.*, externality and practical utility.

The three evolutions, of c h a n ḍ r ā ṭ m ā etc., are spoken of as preceding the minerals etc. They consist of 'pictures,' 'thought-forms,' counterparts (of the succeeding denser creations) in subtler matter, archetypes. For, as explained elsewhere, every object has a counterpart; every object casts its reflexion everywhere. Every atom has such a natural counterpart. Also, because vibratory action and reaction prevail everywhere, the picture or counterpart

[1] Apparently, generally corresponding to the seven planes, the middle one between the two sets of that being the human. But the work is very obscure on these matters.

would receive and reproduce the vibratory movement of the original. All effort, p r a y a ṭ n a, volition, is only effort to reproduce such movement gradually.[1]

But the minerals etc., that we see here might very well themselves be counterparts of some other evolution? Very true (and this in an endless chain of planes, any consecutive two of which are as part and counterpart, image and object, shadow and reality, obverse and reverse, cause and effect, with a third, interpenetrating, linking and holding them together)[2]. But from the standpoint of our b r a h m ā n d a, the minerals etc., are the real and the others the ideal. While reflexions arise out of reflexions and copies out of copies *ad infinitum*, at the same time, of any given pair, it is obvious that one must be regarded as the original and the other as the copy, one more dense and real and the other more shadowy and ideal; and of this, the immediacy and prominence in time, space and consciousness is the test. (That which appears to me here, now, before me, is the real to me).

It is obvious that shadow and original are inseparable, are reversed continuations of each

---

[1] See *The Science of Peace*, p. 268, on pseudo-infinite radiations.

[2] *Ibid.*, on ṭ r i b h u v a n a m, p. 279.

other, and mutually dependent; and therefore the subtler planes are describable by the same adjectives as the denser. This is but another consequence and illustration of the universal reign of Unity over Diversity.

Minerals, vegetables and animals are grouped under one name. The element of E ṭ a ṭ prevails in them, *i.e.*, the M ū l a-p r a k ṛ ṭ i aspect is most active and prominent. In the other three, the element of A h a m or P r a ṭ y a-g ā ṭ m ā prevails. As a thing (*i.e.*, the physical sheath) is gross, with e ṭ a ṭ, objectivity, preponderating, so its 'knowledge,' its psychical functioning, is vague, dim, inchoate. As it is subtle, permeated by spirit, so clear and lucid, refined, detailed and definite, is its knowledge and mental functioning generally. The quality of mind-function is governed by the amount of interpenetration of the I and the Not-I. Therefore, as the completion of these two sets of three kingdoms each there appears the seventh, the human.[1] In this stage, exact knowledge

[1] From all this we gather that the human stage is the middle and turning-point between the physical and the superphysical evolutions. But the exact details yet remain to seek. Only the vaguest notions of c h a n ḍ r ā ṭ m a etc., are possible. Theosophical literature yields many helpful suggestions. But, obviously that literature is very young and

of all becomes possible. The fruits of karma proper are also experienced here.

It is declared that out of minerals arose vegetables; out of vegetables animals; out of these, the three kingdoms of chanḍrāṭmā etc., and out of these arose humanity, the summation of all. The work of humanity becomes possible only when both Self and Not-Self are at work intensely. The word mānava[1] means

daily growing, and very much more remains to be found out than has been disclosed. What the exact relations are to each other of the Sun and the planets, the solar and the planetary Logoi, the Logoi and the globes of the system, the Logoi and the ṭaṭṭvas and the ḍevas and the sensory and motor organs and the various kingdoms, the evolutions of what has been called elemental essence and of the visible kingdoms and again of the ethereal past and future races and the various piṭṛis and the ḍeva-evolutions—all these are matter for prolonged research, or for future revelation. While the spiritual or metaphysical principles are fairly clear and unchanging and all-dominant, the material, *i.e.*, superphysical plus physical, details are endless and ever new.

[1] The root is man, to 'mind,' to think. Mānava also means 'Child of Manu'. Manu has the same root man and means the thinker; also the 'thought,' hence a manṭra, a sacred *sound* or word or formula which is constantly recited and

manyaṭe sarvam anena, 'that whereby all is minded, comprehended, understood'; and this is done only in the human condition (when only both Self and Not-Self can be realised in the fulness of each—only one prevailing in the other kingdoms or evolutions). Knowledge undoubtedly exists in all kingdoms, yet because these two are not both contrasted pointedly against each other, therefore there is no sharp feeling of personality and no true *discrimination* (between I and thou, Self and Not-Self, before and after, cause and effect, etc.) And because of this absence of discrimination there is no 'reaping of the fruits of karma' in those kingdoms. (That is to say, the sense of personality, which is defined only by sharp contrasts, like everything else, is weak in those kingdoms, animals on the one hand, the lower ḍevas etc., on the other, and therefore the law of karma works amongst them in its primal form of causality, *without the co-efficient* of consciousness and conscience, which it acquires in the human kingdom. The stronger and more defined the 'personality' or 'individuality'—in the general sense of feeling one-self

its meaning thought on, to make a permanent centre of consciousness, an ideal, a protective will force, a resting-place when the mind is vacant or worried, etc.

a separate being among other separate beings, not in the technical sense where 'personality' is made to mean the astro-physical body, 'individuality' the kāraṇa or mento-causal body or Higher Ego, and 'monad'—a still subtler and more long-lasting sheath and so on—the keener is the deliberateness, the consciousness, the sense of personal initiative, attached to each act of pleasure-giving or pain-giving and each event of pleasure-receiving or pain-receiving; and these acts and events, because of this co-efficient of consciousness on either side, become *i.e.*, are called, merit or sin on the one hand and reward or punishment on the other; and the co-efficient consciousness puts on the form of conscience).

Because the characteristics of the Separate and the Relative are *included* within the Inseparate and Absolute therefore—because and by means of this foil-and-counterfoil, interplay of Self and Not-Self—the illusory appearance of individual effort and initiative also appears everywhere within the ever impersonal, mechanical, universal functioning of the Absolute Svabhāva or Nature. And because cause and effect are always to be found connected together, therefore the cause-force which appears as *individual effort* has always as counterpart the effect movement appearing as *desired-experience*.

The gradual transcendence of this condition of intensely-defined individuality, after it has been experienced and tested in its fulness, is the work of the Path of Renunciation, and, step by step, leads to m o k ṣ h a from the bonds of k a r m a, (in the same sense in which the animals and ḍ e v a s are free from k a r m a, but on a far higher turn of the spiral). And such transcendence is recommended to the j ī v a which has finished its career on the Path of Pursuit.

In the human stage, all conscious achievement depends upon one's own (conscious) exertions. In that stage, discrimination becomes possible; the discrimination, *viz.*, that such and such conduct is inappropriate to such and such circumstances, such other appropriate; and out of this discrimination develops the idea of right and wrong.[1] As the *Veḍas* declare, "From j ñ ā n a, knowledge, arises v i v e k a, discrimination, thence k a r m a, ethical action." Amongst minerals, vegetables, animals, there is only j ñ ā n a (outer knowledge) of objects, not discrimination, for the A h a m-element is not equal (to but less than the E ṭ a t-element). So too is there only j ñ ā n a (inner cognition of sensations of a higher kind) amongst the

[1] See *The Science of the Emotions* (2nd edn.), ch. xii, pp. 214-222.

c h a n ḍ r ā ṭ m ā s etc., because in them the E ṭ a ṭ-element is not equal (to but less than the A h a m-element).

But, it may be questioned, in the first place there is no proof that knowledge without discrimination cannot lead to (ethical) action, and secondly, even if it be so, what proof is there that the knowledge possessed by animals etc., is not accompanied by discrimination? The reply is that what is meant is simply this, *viz.*, that the activity of minerals etc., is 'natural' or 'mechanical,' p r ā k ṛ ṭ a. In all such activity, determined by 'nature,' there is no accompanying (clear and individualised) perception, ideation, or volition. And hence all such (natural or mechanical action) is of the nature of Freedom and non-bondage; it is automatic.[1] The j ī v a s

---

[1] Auto-matic means 'Self-moved' etymologically, and 'mechanical and lifeless' by convention. How does the same word come to mean two entirely opposite things? The distinction between the two views of the World-process, (i. that all its infinite movement is Absolutely mechanical and ii. that it is everywhere individual-initiated, carried on by living intelligences) and the reconciliation of the two have been mentioned elsewhere. Briefly, 'what is every one's property is no one's property,' 'extremes meet'. What is moved by the Universal Self is mechanically moved; what is moved by an

that possess discrimination (of Self and Not-Self, before and after, cause and effect) fall into, *i.e.*, become conscious of, the bondage, the binding consequences, of action; for discrimination is the basis of ideational, rational and voluntary action. But, if this be so, how is achievement of emancipation possible in the human body thus wrapped in bondage? The answer is: The Āṭmā, in the human stage attains perfection by completion of its evolution with the help of yoga. This perfection is the equality, equilibration, of Aham and Eṭaṭ. This is the complete Fullness. All the ways (prescribed for aspirants) are prescribed only for the sake of accomplishing this equilibration.[1]

---

individual self is livingly moved. From the transcendental standpoint, the whole movement of the World-process as a Total is mechanical. From the empirical standpoint each particular movement is initiated by some one individual. In the word 'auto-matic,' the instinct of the public has embodied this great truth. The realisation of this transcendental fact is moksha; of the empirical only, bondage.

[1] In one aspect, in terms of superphysics, moksha is gained from any given plane of matter, by a jīva, when that jīva succeeds in dropping the 'permanent atom' of that plane, by, so to say, dissolving it; this dissolution being apparently

Bondage and Freedom could not be spoken of in a state of complete, unchangeable and insuperable inequality (any more than they could be in a state of perfect equality and equilibrium of Self and Not-Self). Bondage is the *appearance* (in consciousness) of inequality (the arbitrary excess of one over another) in the midst of equilibrium; the appearance being due to the predominance (for the time being) of the opposition (which is inherent in the Not-Self) to the Unity of the One. Conversely, Freedom is the appearance of equilibrium in the unequal, under the dominance of the convergence towards the Unity which is the characteristic of the Self.

In the Full, the Eternal, the Equal Paramāṭmā which is Aham-Eṭaṭ-Na, the three *appear* separately. By the necessity of the Nature of the Trinity, there *appears* in *succession*, within the eternal equilibrium, now a preponderance of the I over the Not-I, now of the Not-I over the I, and now of the Not over both. The preponderance of the Eṭaṭ is the bondage of the Aham, out of which bondage arises the triplet of the bound, the bond and the binder;

---

brought along by a complete samāḍhi, a withdrawal of consciousness, from it, whereby the 'vortex-bubble' which constitutes the atom 'ceases to be,' as an electric fan ceases to revolve when the electric force is cut off.

and the cause of it all is inherent in the Eṭaṭ (*viz.*, is its *limitedness* which becomes *succession* in time, space and motion. *Per contra*, the preponderance of the Aham is its freedom from Eṭaṭ, with its implied triplet of the freed, the freedom and the free-or, all arising out of the inherent all-comprehending changeless fulness of the Aham).

Such, then is the gradual appearance and growth of inequality and disturbance in the midst of equilibrium and *vice versa*. And the net result of it all is that the Same attains to the Same, the self laboriously travels round to where the Self always is, there being in reality neither bondage nor freedom.[1]

---

[1] Compare the shānṭi verse of the *Upaniṣhaṭs*: "That is Full, This is Full etc." All this portion of the text endeavors to interpret the World-process in that aspect which is dwelt on in the *Sāṅkhya*-system as the principal one ; namely, that all manifestation, all movement, all the world-*procession*, all activity of any kind, is a throwing out of equilibrium of that which was in equilibrium. The *Sāṅkhya* pictures this primal equilibrium as consisting of the three guṇas, conceived as forces, pulling against each other so as to exactly balance and neutralise each other. As soon as this arrangement is thrown out of the exact balance, movement begins. This is a good picture, no doubt, a great step towards the

All the manifest world, thus, consists but of alternations of equality and inequality, differentiation and homogeneity. In the minerals etc., there is great inequality, great difference in quantity, so to say, of Not-Self and Self. In the

---

solution; but it is not the whole solution itself. It is wholly objective yet, something external; not yet 'come home,' not reduced into terms of our own consciousness, our inner experience, terms of the first person. And the step is gained by understanding subjectively the three g u ṇ a s as inherent in our psycho-physical constitution. But the final solution, the fullest significance of all this about equilibrium and its disturbance, is understood when we arrive at the metaphysical, transcendental, standpoint and realise that the Perfect, Eternal, Definite, Changeless equilibrium and equality, s ā m y a, of I, Not-I, Not is the real equilibrium; and that the successive is the necessary appearance of inequilibrium therein, for in order that there may be appearance, manifestations, at all, it must be the appearance of someone *more than* of any other in a given time, place and motion; and this moreness of one over all others is disproportion, inequilibrium, inequality, v a i s h a m y a, which is the very condition of manifestation. The s ā m y a and v a i s h a m y a of the three g u ṇ a s, in the case of any given individual j ī v a or world-system, making its freedom and bondage or evolution and dissolution, are comparative imitations, more or less close (but *never* complete) by the

human body, there is equality of the two in the atoms composing it (? *i.e.*, the atoms composing the human body in its different layers of subtler and grosser sheaths, are composed of elements of and embodied Self and Not-Self in almost equal degree and hence are peculiarly 'alive,' to the extent necessary to serve as vehicle to consciousness at the human stage). Therefore is knowledge highly developed and specialised in man. Only when the j ī v a attains to the human stage and vehicle can it grasp the Truth of B r a h m a n and realise it.

The sum and substance of all this teaching is this: Know all Self to be as One, realise the Self and the Not-Self in One, and then perform all actions. This whole creation, because its seeds, its sperm and germ, are Self and Not-Self both, is therefore ever everywhere either evolving or involving, and therefore also is it ever everywhere an unfixable In-de-finite in essence (though definite in appearance), order

---

empirical of what is complete only in the Transcendental. In terms of P r a v ṛ ṭ ṭ i and N i v ṛ ṭ ṭ i, the gradual growth of inequality and differentiation by the increasing preponderance of the manyness of the Not-Self, is bondage and P r a v ṛ ṭ ṭ i; and the gradual return to equality and homogeneity by the increasing preponderance of the Unity of the Self, is freedom and N i v ṛ ṭ ṭ i.

within disorder, disorder within order, both equally ministering to the manifestation of the Unity which pervades and holds together all Diversity.

This Unity in Diversity is comprehended and mokṣha gained by the jīva when it comes to occupy the human vehicle after passing through six previous kingdoms. These six creations are all planned out in terms of the *Mahāvākyas.* Minerals, vegetables and animals are and are to be understood (in their essence) by means of the 'interposed combination,' anuyoga, (?) of Aham and Na in and with Eṭaṭ, Eṭaṭ, and Eṭaṭ (?). So too chandrāṭmā, saurāṭmā and abhyāṭmā, by that of Eṭaṭ and Na in Aham, Aham, and Aham (?). After that Aham, Eṭaṭ and Na become equalised in the human kingdom.

It is true that in the human kingdom also there are many varieties on the same principle of ever-interwoven definiteness and indefiniteness, and the elements of Self and Not-Self are different in quantity, and not exactly equal; still from the universal standpoint of a general survey, there is a comparative equality of the two here. On the other hand, from the truly transcendental standpoint of the Universal, all (kingdoms, without any distinction) must be accepted as equally Brahman. Hence does the Scripture

say that by opposition and correspondence (*i.e.*, mutual support and help), by hostility and affinity (at the same time), arise definition as well as indefiniteness[1]. Looked at thus, minerals, c h a n ḍ r ā ṭ m ā s, humans, etc., are all definite as well as indefinite, equal as well as unequal. Amongst minerals also, for instance, progressive evolution takes place in pursuance of cycles.

Because of the great subtleness of c h a n-ḍ r ā ṭ m ā s etc., only the four well-known kingdoms of minerals, vegetables, animals and humans are treated. In general terms these four are called respectively s ṭ h ā v a r a, unmoving, j a ṅ g a-m a, moving, a n d a j a, oviparous, p i n d a j a, viviparous.[2]

The sub-divisions of these are many. Thus, minerals range from the a ḍ h i ṣ h ṇ a (?) to the

---

[1] Determination, definition, is by negation or opposition. But no two opposites are wholly cut off from each other. They are not only opposed but *inseparably* opposed. Each depends upon, inheres in the very heart of, the other. Hence, indefiniteness also, the inability to define exactly where one ends and the other ends ; *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, ii. 28 ; both opposites are everywhere, mutually pervasive.

[2] In current Samskṛṭ literature, 'creatures' are first divided into the unmoving and the moving, and the latter sub-divided into u ḍ b h i j j a, fissiparous, s v e ḍ a j a, gemmational, and oviparous and viviparous.

maṇi (the completely crystallised gem). The chanḍra and other evolutions may be conceived of by analogy to what we see here. In general terms, the three are named ḍeva, praḍeva and anuḍeva, as the minerals are called sṭhāvara etc. (As, from the standpoint of the whole of our particular brahmāṇda or world-system, the 'unmoving' kingdom includes many divisions, the minerals of this earth and the allied varieties of other planets, and as the 'moving' includes the vegetation of this and the allied types of other planets etc., so ḍeva includes the superphysical kingdoms of this as well as other globes of the system ?). While interdependent (more or less) yet the various evolutions are also distinct from each other, on the same general law of continuity in discreteness. Hence the ḍeva evolution is said to be separate from the human (in a greater degree than the minerals etc., because the interdependence is less obvious).[1]

The sub-divisions of the ḍeva-kingdom are Bhūṭas, Preṭas, Pishāchas, Ganḍharvas

---

[1] But none the less, as much a fact. While the interdependence of minerals etc., with the human is largely physical, in the shape of physical food and appliances of life, that of the ḍevas etc., is largely superphysical, in the shape of psychical, *i.e.*, emotional and mental-matter nourishment and mutual support. *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, iii. 11.

Yakṣhas, Rākshasas, Viḍyāḍharas, Parānasṭhas, Kinnaras, Siḍḍhas, Chāraṇas, Uṭkalas, Vaikalas, Yākshikas, Apsarasas, Uragas, etc., etc. They have all their own appointed times and places (*i.e.*, times of wakeful functionings and occupations and of sleep and rest, and habitats in various planes and sub-planes of matter and corresponding regions of the space of our system). Some wake in what is day to us; some in the night; others at eve or morn or both; some at midday; others in the afternoon; others at midnight. Thus they live their conscious life, and wander about; and they do so in their own appropriate worlds or planes, as guided by the necessity of their being, (the inner ruling desire and the material constitution of their bodies or vehicles, which always corresponds to that desire). In special conditions, dreams etc., they may be contacted by humans. They are all prāvṛṭa (? 'enveloped,' discernible by the subtler sense which belongs to the anupāḍaka-ṭaṭṭva and the corresponding sub-plane of the pṛṭhvi-ṭaṭṭva)[1].

The beings of the ḍeva-worlds come to this along the lines of natural atomic connexions; and, conversely, humans also attain to the

[1] See ch. xxxiv *supra*, on the 'sensations' belonging to the āḍi and anupāḍaka-ṭaṭṭvas, *viz.*, samvṛṭa, prāvṛṭa, etc.

subtler states during sleep. (In other words, the subtler planes where the human jīva works during dreams, slumber, etc., are common to both). On these subtler planes humans and ḍevas come together according to inherent affinities. Dreams may be prevented by manṭras, magic-chants, because of the manifold powers residing in sounds of various qualities arranged in various orders.

The habitats of the various classes of the ḍevas are, as said elsewhere, Kāma-loka etc., with their sub-divisions of Preṭa-loka etc.

The moral of the whole teaching is that all worlds and planes are interrelated because of the Unity of Brahman and the continuum of the World-process; and that at the same time all this separateness and multiplicity is pure Illusion, for the Many is Not. Thus understanding the metaphysical truth we are able to grasp the inner laws of the working of the main kinds of substances or ṭaṭṭvas, sense-qualities or guṇas, and movements or karmas, (five of each in our present evolution); and knowing these in their principal aspects we know everything that is necessary for practical purposes. Thus realising that nothing in the World-process is really more wonderful than anything else, we are able to do our duty calmly, whatever our sphere in life may be for the time.

And all knowledge of details of superphysics, and power to deal with forces and beings of other planes, is useful only as helping us to perform our duty along the course of evolution and involution.

Each of the seven kingdoms mentioned, four visible and three invisible, has seven principal sub-divisions, though the minor sub-divisions and multiplications by 'pictures,' 'thought-forms,' 'shadows' (astral counterparts etc.) are infinite. Knowledge of the details of these enables one to 'create' minerals and plants or to develop one mineral out of another, etc.—which is the subject-matter of chemistry and medicine. Dhātu-vāḍa, mineralogy, describes the methods of forming minerals,[1] and shows how the three aspects of consciousness, cognition, desire and action, exist in the minerals also, as everywhere else. It is also shown there how, because of the absence of finality anywhere, there are minerals within minerals, endlessly. The study

[1] The original Samskṛṭ word is ḍhāṭu. It is very doubtful if the English word 'mineral' is a good equivalent. But it is so regarded currently. Of course, it has been repeatedly pointed out that it is almost impossible for a word (with a different root) belonging to one language to exactly equate with another word (with another root) from another language.

of mineralogy is a necessary adjunct of the study of medicine. The various compounds of the minerals and their good and ill effects ought to be well understood; and then they can be fitly employed to cure diseases; (for there is a correspondence between the seven main mineral ḍhāṭus and the seven main physiological ḍhā-ṭus, constituent tissues of the human body, muscular, osseous, fatty, etc.) Three[1] main kinds

---

[1] These are the barest indications of the metaphysical principles which form the foundation of the science of medicine. The three main classes into which diseases may be divided are (i) those of the cognitive or intellectual temperament, connected with saṭṭva and piṭṭa, (ii) those of the active temperament, with rajas and vāyu, (iii) those of the emotional or desire-temperament, with ṭamas and kapha. The current classifications of temperaments, choleric, bilious, phlegmatic, nervous, lymphatic, sanguine etc., will all fall under this principal tripartite classification, and be explained by it; for it alone is based on metaphysics and psychophysics. And the various systems of medicine, 'allopathy,' homeopathy, chromopathy, hydropathy, etc., etc., could also all be arranged into corresponding three heads, one kind being specially suitable to one temperament. Thus the intellectual temperament, with delicate nervous system and keen sense-organs will be better dealt with, in illness, by methods

of medicines or methods of treatment are therefore prescribed for three main kinds of diseases, *viz.*, ḍhāṭu-rasāyana or by minerals, vanaspaṭi-rasāyana or by vegetables, and mixed. But it should be clearly understood that because the Trinity of Aham-Eṭaṭ-Na exists everywhere, and the Trinity *is* all also, therefore all is potentially medicine for all. Hence is it said that the mineral is (food and) medicine for the vegetable; the vegetable for the mineral; the two for the animal; animals for ḍevas;[1]

---

which soothe the nerves, music, scents, changes of scene, light medicines, etc.; the active, by methods of physical exercise, massage, hot and cold applications, douches, enemas, etc.; the dull, clinging desire-ful one, by methods of drugging, stimulants, etc. But, of course, it should always be borne in mind that no man is exclusively composed of one factor only, and that all three are present in all, but only one predominant; hence endless complications. Thus, where the diseased condition is due to the excessive exercise of the constitutional and temperamental tendencies, for instance nervous breakdown by overstudy in the man of thought, the proper remedy would be a change to a course of action or of art, and *vice versa*; for though inequilibrium is the condition of manifestation, yet too much disproportion means death.

[1] This is said probably with greater reference to the so-called 'lower' ḍevas or nature-spirits who

all for humans. And therefore are vaiḍyas, physicians, instructed to master all knowledge, (the word vaiḍya has the same root as Veḍa, *viz.*, viḍ, to know), before beginning their function of curing diseases. A rule, an order, of succession is necessary in the realm of the Successive, the World-process; and where there is order, there will be disorder also; and individuals are wanted, as rulers, to maintain the order and cure the disorder; such is the *raison d'être* of physicians.

Also, a knowledge of minerals and plants is needed for the manufacture of the multifarious appliances of life. Paḍārṭha-shāsṭra, 'the science of objects,' physical science, is made up of observations of and practical experiments with minerals and plants, with reference to spanḍa and sphuraṇa, *i.e.*, the vibrations, movements, functionings, of their constituent particles, molecules, atoms. Atoms and their movements are at the bottom of all

---

probably find congenial nourishment out of the aura of the 'passions' and 'play' of animals; also perhaps with reference to the more 'evil' ḍevas who find food in the superphysical exhalations of blood-sacrifices etc. As regards the 'higher' ḍevas, the semi-impersonal 'forces of nature,' they are nourished by the finer emotion-aroma of humans and react with physical and superphysical blessings.

'manifestation' of substance and force. And therefore physical science deals with these, not only as working in the mineral and vegetable kingdoms, but in creations earlier and later than these. Different vibrations give rise to different forms. The results are more quickly perceived in the case of minerals and plants because of the comparative 'grossness' of the atoms concerned. By a knowledge of such matters many works can be accomplished which are impossible otherwise, *e.g.*, the manufacture of special weapons. In *Bāṇāvarṭa-shāsṭra*, 'the science of the arrow-ring,' the 'exposition' of the bow is based on the a u s h a ḍ h a, chemistry, of minerals and completed with m a n ṭ r a s. On the knowledge of physical science are based the achievements which *Iṭihāsa*, history, records: "The air-car rushes by the pathless ways of the air; 'pictures' engage in conversation; arrows pierce through minutest spaces and destroy all things etc." Therefore in order to understand the constitution of each atom, to realise why it is called B r a h m a n, physical science and the science of its application, *Parivāḍa-shāsṭra*, (and or *i.e.*, ?) medical (or applied) science should be studied; all which, again, is based on the Praṇava, determined and developed into primal laws and forms by the *Mahā-vākyas*,

and constitutes the contents, the infinite glories, the attributes, of the Self, expanded, expounded, evolved forth by kriyā, action (negatively, by inseparable contrast with the attributes of the Not-Self).

The principles of all this should be mastered and conduct regulated accordingly.

From another standpoint, minerals, vegetables, etc., are sub-divided into (i) natural and (ii) artificial, kṛṭrima and a-kṛṭrima. The former are developed by natural vibratory action and reaction. The latter are developed, *e.g.*, minerals out of minerals, by similar processes brought about by human beings deliberately. A third kind, different from (but including) both (?) may be regarded as ḍhaṭuṭva, mere 'mineral-ness'. So the uncultivated, self-growing, wild, plants growing by unchecked rotation of seed and plant may be regarded as natural. The artificial are plants produced by grafting, crossing etc. The third is the 'type' which includes both, and represents the Unity of the Self, as the variations represent the multiplicity of the Not-Self.

Ṭarkṣhya-shāsṭra,[1] the science of botany,

---

[1] This word is not current now-a-days. I asked Panḍiṭ Ḍhanarāja at the time, if the word might not be *Vārkṣha-shastra*, vṛkṣha being the current word for tree. But he was positive that it was ṭārkṣhya.

should be studied in order to understand the vegetable kingdom and master the uses and applications of plants for the production of scents, tasteful viands, colors, fibres of soft and delicate touch, and also musical instruments and sounds. The processes of origin, growth and decay of each vegetable form are described in this science; also the months and seasons in which it germinates, grows, etc.; and in which it is most effective in use; its medicinal properties and uses, its comparative heat- or force-generating capacity, its genus and species and allied species, its possibilities of producing new varieties in combination with other plants, and so forth.

Shilpakas, practical chemists, artists and artisans, also all need this knowledge. It tells them what plants are useful for 'reducing' or 'killing' or, *per contra*, reviving, which minerals.

So too is this knowledge useful in the treatment of animals. In consequence of natural affinities and disparities (arising out of atomic constitution) the eating of different kinds of plants imparts different qualities, strength, endurance, beauty, sleekness, quickness etc., to different animals. Because of such affinities, different animals select their different foods by instinct. This natural fact is the rational

principle at the bottom of all prescriptions and prohibitions as to eatables and non-eatables (and all medication). What helps on the natural activities of a given organism is proper food for it; what hinders is improper.

Further on, the ḍeva-kingdom also needs this knowledge, and men need it for dealing effectually with the ḍevas. They turn away from or accept offerings according as these are helpful or hostile to their natures.

And all these affinities and disparities, anuroḍha and viroḍha, which all subsist between all, by turns of time, space and motion, are determined by and included in the One Absolute Nature wherein all such opposite likes and dislikes neutralise and abolish each other.

Thus then do we see that though this World-process, above and below, far and near, exists in a pseudo-infinity of separateness, discreteness and manyness which is past all counting, still, because of the Unity of the Universal and Common Being which pervades it, it is all, and in every part, *unified* in the way of interdependence; and the deeper and deeper realisation of this fact is the means to, and is, fuller and fuller mokṣha.

Physical science declares the endlessness of the sub-divisions of the minerals on the basis of the endlessness of vibratory actions and

reactions (of atoms)—which again illustrates the endlessness of the works to be accomplished (the forms to be assumed and cast off) by the Self. From one standpoint, there is in this science a twofold sub-division based on the distinction between external and internal. The external refers to effects; the internal to causes mainly (*i.e.*, practical or applied and theoretical?). All the activities of the world are included in these two. And, accordingly, the science of Botany is also sub-divided into primary and secondary. In reality, however, these divisions and sub-divisions are not only twofold, but pseudo-infinite.

To illustrate the sub-divisions of classes or types, v a r ṇ a, we may take the case of color, v a r ṇ a proper. Of the infinite shades of color which arise in the conjunction and disjunction of A h a m and E ṭ a ṭ and N a three are primary, *viz.*, white, of the nature of light, concerned with cognition, corresponding to A; black, of the nature of darkness, concerned with action, corresponding to U; red, being the combination of the two and n i r-v a r ṇ a (? a negative color), corresponding to M. By combinations of these in different proportions arise all the other colors, yellow, blue, etc. *E.g.*, the day is white, the night is black, and their junction-points, morn and eve, are red.

Considerations of color play a great part, as is well known, in the standards of visual beauty, which vary from time to time, according to necessity, *i.e.*, the compulsion of the inner constitution of the judges for the time being—all things being, in reality, beautiful and ugly by turns. The beautiful is ever that which reflects the self (of the beholder, which the beholder feels to be in assonance with his self); the ugly is the opposite.

Color-effects are given a prominent place in erotic and other poetry. It has been said that the essence of poetry is r a s a, 'taste,' 'juice,' relish, sentiment, unction, motif; r a s a is the expression of an emotion; the essence of emotion is love or hate; these two base in desire; the inner desire of any creature determines its outer manifest condition; the manifest condition of any creature, (in terms of a g n i-ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a), is color; therefore changes of emotion go with changes of color [1]; and therefore these form

[1] Compare the English expressions 'he changed color,' and pale with fear, rosy with pleasure or affection, crimson with shame, red with anger, black with wrath, dark with passion, green with envy, yellow with jealousy, grey with terror, cadaverous with horror, glowing with joy, beaming with pleasure, etc.

Also, we have seen elsewhere that the word v a r ṇ a means caste, because, originally, the

the frequent subject of description in poetry.[1]

A scientific knowledge of color is very useful with reference to the psycho-physics of Kāma-Shāsṭra, the Science of Love, and is of help in judging temperaments from complexions and colors for purposes of marriage-alliances, etc., for 'color' is born of the vibrations, s p a n-ḍ a, of the 'form', and therefore indicates the nature and natural vocation, caste, type, etc., of the latter. The essential object of the Science of Love is to bring about healthful alliances and associations which will promote the welfare of the race. All arises from k ā m a and k ā m a

white color was the mark of the Brāhmaṇa, red of the Kṣhaṭṭriya, brown-yellow of the Vaishya, black of the Shūḍra. The reason of this again was that corresponding ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a s, planes and sub-planes predominated in each respectively. This, among other things, is indicated by the statement that they correspond to the head, the arms, the trunk and the feet of Brahmā, if we interpret this in the light of what is said in one of the minor *Upaniṣhaṭs*, that the p ṛ ṭ h v i-ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a predominates in the lower part of the body, ā p a s and then a g ṇ i in the trunk, v ā y u in the lungs and throat, and ā k ā s h a in the head, etc.

[1] Here follows in the original text a statement of some facts of Samskṛṭ Rhetoric as illustration of color-effects, etc., which it is difficult to reproduce in English.

arises from s a ṅ g a, juxtaposition, association[1]. The conjunction of Self and Not-Self means the birth of the world. The essential significance of k ā m a is, as said before, 'May I become this'. In other words, the limitation of the Universal Will to a limited e ṭ a ṭ, is k ā m a. The *Kāma-pṛavachana-sūṭra* declares that the imagination of the Self as this and thus is k ā m a. This k ā m a is observable in every atom as its desire to multiply. In the 'living being' it manifests in youth, and lies latent at other times, but exists always. The ways of its manifestation in man and woman, representative of Ā ṭ m ā and M ū l a-p r a k ṛ ṭ i, which may be learnt from Kāma-shāsṭra, are typical of the ways of its manifestation in all departments of the World-process.

On this principle, the presence and uses of color may be observed and studied in minerals, vegetables, animals, c h a n d r ā ṭ m ā, etc., also. Visual beauty depends largely on color[2];

---

[1] Compare *Bhagavad-Gīṭā*, ii. 2. Here, juxtaposition or association stands for that face-to-faceness of subject and object which amounts to cognition; out of cognition arises desire, thence action, as has been discussed over and over again.

[2] Thus, the best-cut features are neutralised by a dead complexion, while even ill-cut ones are rendered attractive by a bright smile. The 'bloom'

but, it should be remembered that there is no more any hard and fast line of demarcation between colors than anywhere else in nature. All colors shade off into one another and each co-exists with all the others potentially, as is proved by the same person changing from color to color.

---

of youth paints even an ugly face with brightness, and the glow of noble emotions beautifies countenances the most ravaged by age. That any particular 'form' or any particular color as such is not essential is shown by the simple fact that any and every animal or vegetable form may be beautiful if in vigor and health and corresponding fulness of color; colored flowers and fruits and animals are no less beautiful, if in their perfection, than colorless or white ones; indeed they are often more so. The most ideally beautiful men, of Purāṇic lore, Rāma and Kṛṣhṇa and Pradyumna and Nakula, etc., have been 'dark'. The effect of glazing and varnishing also illustrates the same. In terms of superphysics, this 'bloom' and 'glow' etc., are produced by the quality, the quantity and the nature of the vibration of the etheric and other subtler auras, which for the purposes of beautification or otherwise, produce the same effect on the physical body as glass on a picture or varnish on wood. In cases of intense emotion and consequent great vibration, this aura becomes semi-visible and produces 'halos' which may affect photographic plates.

The ways in which colors mix and agree or disagree is illustrated by the ways in which emotions and poetic sentiments, rasas, with which they correspond, may mix and agree or disagree, be in accord or discord.

Thus shṛṅgāra, the Erotic, mixes with and is present in almost all the other rasas. When the joy of excitement, which is the element of the erotic, arises in the Raudra or the Furious, the latter becomes converted into vīra, the Heroic. The Heroic is characterised by the consciousness of one's own great deeds[1]; hence it is connected with cognition and the Self, but is enveloped in and manifests by action. In other words, shṛṅgāra is of the nature of love; and love is the 'mark' of the Self; and the Self is the root of Unity and

---

[1] The person who does a great act without self-consciousness is something else than a 'hero,' from the standpoint of the poetic sentiment of the Heroic; *e.g.*, if the act be one of self-sacrifice, he may be a saviour, a Christ, a Buddha; but that would be an embodiment of the Pathetic and Compassionate, not the Heroic. Deliberate, self-conscious 'repression of the oppressor and the wrong-doer' is essential to the sentiment of the Heroic, as in the case of Rāma, Kṛshṇa, etc. See *The Science of the Emotions*, (second edition), pp. 89 and 190.

Non-separateness, which 'operates' only in the field of manyness and hate. It becomes possible for enjoyment to appear even in the Furious, because of the immanence of both action and cognition in the Furious.

Similarly, in s h ā n ṭ a, the Peaceful, also, because of its connexion (by contrast and opposition) with love and hate, there is the mixed presence of the Furious and the Erotic (*i.e.*, there is the cognisance of the joys and sorrows, the good and the evil of the world, and the wish for their cessation). The mixture itself of the two is a ḍ b h u ṭ a, the Wondrous. The Marvellous is that which exceeds our powers of comprehension and control. And it appears prominently within the Peaceful, in the contemplation of the paradox of the World-process, where everything, around us and within us, is beginningless and endless and past knowing in its endless detail.

The converse of the Wonderful is the Pathetic or Compassionate, k a r u ṇ a. Pity arises on beholding the l a g h u ṭ v a, inferiority, of another, to oneself; also of oneself to another; and has its source in the 'equality' or 'sameness' of the Self (which requires that none shall be inferior to any other).

The Laughable or Ludicrous arises within the Erotic in consequence of the pride born of

the discovery of another's inferiority to one self. The element of love (of the self) prevails here (in the one who laughs). The Laughable, or h ā s y a, appears within the Peaceful also, when the Ā ṭ m ā is felt as prevailing (over the paradox of the World-process).

When hate prevails, we have b h a y ā n a k a, the Fearful. It arises when one thinks only of his own inferiority (as absolute), forgets relativity and proportion, and sees every one else as only larger and more powerful than himself and (also as ready to do him harm).

Such is the origin of the r a s a s, one within or out of another, and even such is the differentiation of colors[1].

Detailed descriptions of colors and their correspondences with factors in other departments of life, belong to the science of *Sāhiṭya* (gregariousness, grouping together, from s a h i ṭ a, together, 'Society,' Sociology); for all things are connected with all things, so much so that physical science declares that all things can be constructed by vibratory action and reaction. The distinction between animate and inanimate is only the distinction between the

[1] And as of colors, so of sounds, tastes, etc., to all of which, the remarks made in the text regarding colors and poetic sentiments apply also, *mutatis mutandis*.

prevalence of the element of Self and of that of Not-Self respectively. And as the nature of the a h a m animating any atom is, such is the nature of the activities of that atom.

The production of atoms is accomplished by the vibratory action, s p a n ḍ a, of Universal Becoming. And all this world, and all objects of sense herein, scents, etc., are accomplished by the vibratory action, s p a n ḍ a, of atoms, and manifested by vibratory reaction, s p h u r a-ṇ a [1] (?) Although smell, etc., because they are pervaded by Universal Being, s a ṭ ṭ ā-p r ā ḍ h-ā n y a, have a universal existence; yet the determination of their particular names and forms and manifestations depend upon particular vibrations [2].

---

[1] All this translation here is very tentative and doubtful, for lack of positive knowledge as to the meanings of the technical words, no louger current. The sentence in the text is: तस्मात् सर्वमिदं जगदत्रस्थेंद्रियार्थविषयं गंधादिकं अणुस्पंदसिद्धं तत्स्फुरणप्रभूतम्.

[2] In other words, sound, color, smell, etc., in themselves, as ṭ a n-m ā ṭ r a s, 'things-in-themselves,' 'things-as-such,' s v a-l a k s h a ṇ a, 'characterised by themselves,' 'that alone,' as mere moods of consciousness, have the universality also of consciousness, and exist in all parts of time and space; yet the specific manifestations, experiencings, of these, within specific limits of space and time and matter

and motion, *i.e.*, within single world-systems, is inseparable from atoms and vibrations; and the connexions between these, atoms and vibrations of 'objects,' on the one hand, and atoms and vibrations of 'subject'-senses, on the other, and specific varieties of 'sensations' resulting from the contact of the two—these are established by the local consciousness of the Ruler, Brahmâ, etc. That is that such and such a consciousness of smell, taste, etc., shall arise when a so-and-so constituted sense-organ comes into contact with a so-and-so constituted sense-object is determined by the vibrations of both, under the guidance of the local Brahmâ. There is no metaphysically and universally necessary connexion between a particular atom, a particular vibration and a particular sensation. While the three aspects are inseparable, though distinguishable in the abstract; yet a particular atom, vibrating in one way, may produce one sensation in one sensor-organ, and quite another in a differently constituted sensor-organ. And here is the opportunity for the exercise of a certain amount of individual initiative and discretion, *within* general law, by local Brahmâs. But that, yet again, this initiation and discretion too, are only illusory, may be gathered from the consideration that all possible such variations of constitutions of sense-objects and sense-organs and variations of their mutual responses are already eternally present in the Logion. The analogy is complete

Each object having a special nature[1] or constitution, s v a-b h ā v a, the contact of any one with any other produces another (or third variety of object or a new kind of experience or both).

The p r a p a ñ c h a, 'quintuplication,' the

---

between a Brahmā drawing matter from the universal stores of Prakṛti, and building it up into his own system, giving it his own distinctive stamp, and a baby drawing nourishment from the parental stores and building it into his own body and giving it all the stamp of his individuality.

[1] Each object has one special nature, in manifestation, at one time and one place ; but in potency, latently, it has all other possible natures, at the same time and place—because of the Law that everything is everywhere and always, which arises out of the still deeper Law that all *is* one Self, and *in* one Self, which is everywhere and always. Also, every object has all natures, in succession, turn by turn, in different times and places—because of another corollary of the same Law. See *The Science of Peace*, p. 238. The biological aspect of this same law is that each primal biophorid has the infinite possibilities of infinite forms already locked up within it. The table of periodic classification illustrates the chemical aspect of it. The manifestation of all kinds of emotions, turn by turn, by the same living being, is the psychological aspect of it. And so on.

multiplicity of the world and its kingdoms of minerals, vegetables, etc., is due to such contacts. The A h a m-element gradually grows over the others in these, successively. Hence is it said that vegetables arise out of minerals; animals out of those; c h a n d r ā ṭ m ā, etc., out of those, and so on.

Among varieties of minerals are m a ṇ i, r a ṭ n a, s u v a r ṇ a (gold), v i l o m a, m ā-s h a k y a, m a n o b h a v a, ṭ ā m r a (copper), h e m a (another variety of gold ?), p r a m a u k-ṭ i k a, p r a v ā l a (?coral), s h a ṅ k h a, etc.[1]

[1] It has not been possible for me to fix the precise meanings of these. The detailed knowledge having been lost, many words are used now loosely as synonyms which must have meant different varieties of the same mineral, or even quite different principal minerals and metals. We have had the case of the different names of v ā y u (air), agṇi (fire), etc., in Sec. III, ch. x., on the *Upaniṣhaṭs*. Nowadays s u v a r ṇ a and h e m a are both used for gold; also many other words, c h ā m ī k a r a, j ā m b ū n a d a, k ā ñ c h a n a, etc. Quite probably, these meant originally, not merely different varieties of gold, but different valuable metals. The *Harivamṣha*, when describing Kṛṣhṇa's palace in Ḍvārakā, names many scores of precious stones and metals used in the construction, which cannot be identified now.

So are there many varieties amongst vegetables and animals. So among c h a n ḍ r ā ṭ m ā s, etc., among whom also the A h a m more or less preponderates over the E ṭ a ṭ, so that g a n-ḍ h a r v a s, etc., begin to exercise special powers. 'Propitiation' is made of such beings of the Kāmaloka (semi-personal and semi-impersonal forces of nature) in order to secure their powers and services for the use of this world, by means which are based on a knowledge of the special relationships, affinities and antipathies, subsisting between the inhabitants and the objects of different planes. But, of course, the power thus gained is a-s a ṭ, 'false,' of a poor quality, because extraneous and dependent on others, and not existing within oneself. The better way is to develop one's own will-power and other faculties (by y o g a). The methods of obtaining control over g a n ḍ h a r-v a s, etc., are taught in the science of the *Ṭanṭra*. But such processes should be employed very sparingly and for special cause only. If worked recklessly, harm will come to the operator most certainly. Nor are such methods to be practised by any and every body; they can be followed safely only in a progressive way and by those specially qualified as laid down in the works on the subject.

Such are a few hints on the ḍ e v a-creation, included in the U.

The human creation is the seventh and the summation of the other six.[1] It is the highest

---

[1] All this part of the text has been full of obscure statements and it is difficult to see what exactly is meant by this particular statement. The general metaphysical idea is apparently that the three physical and the three 'superphysical' kingdoms are all lacking in that definite 'sense of personality,' 'individual free will,' 'egoism' which is the characteristic of m a n a s and the 'human' stage proper, whatever the form of the body be. And they all sub-consciously strive towards this human stage, when the turning on to the n i v ṛ ṭ ṭ i-mārga and m o k ṣ h a become possible. It is thought generally that these three superphysical kingdoms with their multifarious sub-divisions are composed of 'nature-sprites' of different grades, high and low, who 'make' natural objects, flowers, leaves, streams, etc. But it should be remembered that all living beings act and react on each other more or less, and consciously or unconsciously 'make' natural objects. Insects of various kinds, in their millions and billions, perforate the upper surfaces of the earth, in certain seasons and countries, and help to give it special chemical qualities; others carry the pollen of flowers from place to place; birds help to scatter seeds over wide stretches; the coral insect makes the reefs; forests make rain, and rains makes more

because it includes all the other six. As said before, the human body is the best of all bodies[1]; it is the perfected temple of Brahman, and sums up all creation in itself.

---

forest; human occupation produces climatic changes; in short, all nature is alive, and every living creature, microscopic or gigantic, reacts on the 'nature' of which its body is a product, in some way or other, by living or by dying, consciously or unconsciously. In this sense, all living creatures are nature-spirits also; but of course those may be more especially designated thus in whom the impersonal prevails over the personal. In the three lower 'physical' kingdoms, the impersonal is working chiefly in the denser sub-planes of the physical plane, apparently; as, in the three superphysical, it is probably so working in the subtler. The two 'collapse' together into the human, and attain the 'sense of personality,' to be gradually transcended again, later on. The statements on the elemental kingdoms, the elemental essence, the work of the various classes of Piṭṛs, in theosophical literature, slowly becoming clearer and more systematic, as more and more knowledge is gained on these obscure and occult subjects, will be of use to the student in understanding the text here, and, *vice versa*, the text here in understanding them.

[1] We have to bear in mind that the present pentagonal shape is not the only and not necessarily even the best shape of the human body,

It may be questioned what is meant by the summation of all creations in some one particular creation, when each one of these and its 'picture'-creation (its astral counterpart, etc.), has been said to be pseudo-infinite. The answer is that though each is potentially pseudo-infinite yet is each also 'graded' with all the rest, because of the Law of Unity, in a single Endless and Universal Scheme of evolution and involution; and hence there must be in any given world-system some one particular stage or creation which represents and reflects, imitates and masquerades as, the Summation, the Total, also. (In our world-system) the human being is such (microcosm of the macrocosm, standing at the turning point between the two arcs of the wheel of life). And the 'picture,' c h i ṭ r a, thereof is similar also. The product, the progeny, of a surety attains, sooner or later, to the condition, the status, of the producer, the progenitor. Hence the c h i ṭ-r a-s ā r i s, the 'painters,' declare that the picture 'draws out', a n u-k a r ṣ h a ṭ i, the pictured, the original, (carries away some of his vital essence). The 'pictures' (reflexions,

---

which has been spherical and egg-shaped and ethereal in the previous root-races and may be such again in the later races. See *The Vishṇu-Bhāgavaṭa*.

thought-forms) of men, also, thus, under a universal law, become men (in course of time)[1].

The *Vedas* declare that knowledge of universal nature is possible only by means of the human body, for herein occurs the summation (the requisite complete development and balancing) of cognition, action and desire (*i.e.*, of Self, Not-Self and Negation). Therefore do all beings desire the human state.

As there are seven kingdoms in this world, so are there seven sheaths in the human body; and in each sheath is woven, u p a-n y a s ṭ a, the ṭ a ṭ ṭ v a of one plane, in its universal as well as concrete aspect. For such reasons is the human body called a l a g h u-b r a h m ā n d a, a 'small world-egg'.

The seven bodies are (i) s t h ū l a, 'gross'

---

[1] In this connexion consider (i) the statement in *The Secret Doctrine*, about various classes of *Piṭṛs* giving their c h h ā y ā s, shadows, emanations, to clothe to the earlier Races; (ii) the fact that the difference between emotion-vitalised thought-forms and other emanations and radiations from living beings, on the one hand, and the 'reproductive' cells thrown off by them, is a difference only of degree, not of kind; (iii) the beliefs prevalent amongst some people about the dangers of giving pictures or other personal belongings to others who are suspected of evil ṭ ā n ṭ r i k a doings.

or physical; (ii) liṅga, 'mark', 'type', ethereal; (iii) sūkṣhma, 'subtle', 'minute', astral; (iv) manas, 'mind', lower mind (or kama-manas), mental; (v) mānasa, 'mental', higher mind, causal, (vi) buḍḍhi, 'awareness', 'intuition' all-comprehensive and pure reason, loving wisdom, buḍḍhic; (vii) Āṭmā, āṭmic[1]. All are synthesised and summed up in and by the Āṭmā, and hence they all appear as and in one.

The distinctive features thereof are these: Buḍḍhi is the sheath of Āṭmā (as Mūla-prakṛṭi is of Praṭyagāṭmā). Its nature is prakāsha, light, illumination, discovery of the whole truth about all and everything. Without it, it were impossible even to speak of the Āṭmā. There is always an unbreakable connexion between sañjñā and rūpa, name (also consciousness) and form. Therefore the (Universal Principle signified by the name Āṭmā needs a sheath for manifestation, is indeed ever inseparable from it; (for a sheath is to the core, as a particular object is to the common name, a concrete instance to an abstract law, a singular individual to an archetype);

[1] For a table of correspondences between this list and other divisions and classifications, see *The Advanced Text Book of Sanāṭana Dharma*, Pt. I, ch. vi., p. 162.

Aham receives the appellation of Āṭmā when and because involved in Eṭaṭ. So, Eṭaṭ receives the names of Anāṭmā and Buḍḍhi when and because pervaded and permeated and enclosed by Āṭmā. Buḍḍhi becomes differentiated into the higher and the lower. Generally speaking, when the thought is concerned preponderantly with the Self, we have the higher form of it; in other connexions, the lower.

A question arises: The Āṭmā, the Self, is the 'possessor' of bodies, not itself a body; why count it as one among seven bodies, then? The answer is: Because the body and the embodied are 'not separate' and therefore are the 'same' *i.e.*, similar [1].

Thus then Buḍḍhi (in its two sub-divisions) and Āṭmā make one combination [2]. So too

---

[1] See *The Science of Peace*, pp. 209, 210, for an explanation how by mutual aḍhyāsa, superimposition or reflexion of each other's attributes, core and sheath, self and body, spouse and spouse come to resemble each other also, even while differing.

[2] These triplets have been dealt with in a previous foot-note. Briefly, the 'ideal' or metaphysical triplet which is the paradigm for every one of endless 'real' or particular triplets, is that of the universal and unlimited Self, a limited and concrete

Mānasa and Manas make one combination. The eṭaṭ reversed, āvarṭita, (*i.e.*, overpoweringly colored and impregnated with the nature of Āṭmā) in a compound of Aham and eṭaṭ is the Mānasa (the higher mind). It is intermediary, vyavahiṭa, (? between Āṭmā-Buḍḍhi and the others). Its work is to indicate (to the lower) the reality and certainty that it gains from Buḍḍhi. It 'experiences,' perceives, the pure and the true because of its proximity to Buḍḍhi, which in turn is in conjunction with the Āṭmā.

---

atom, and the network of desire-force connecting them. Āṭmā, higher buḍḍhi, lower buḍḍhi make a triplet which would perhaps be denominated monad in current theosophical phraseology. This monad, and mānasa and manas would probably be called ego, or 'spirit'; another triplet made up of ego, and some lower principles might be called 'individuality'; or 'personality'; and so on, endlessly, according to the idiosyncrasies of the writers. Such naming is not yet settled. By and by, as more and more attention is paid to the subject by more and more people, and the need grows for mutual communications about it, the terminology will get settled. In the meanwhile the general principle should be quite clear, and if kept in mind thus clearly will help the work of mutual understanding even through varying terminology.

The distinction between the two is that Buḍḍhi ascertains and determines, 'this is thus, certainly' and Mānasa suggests, (passes to the lower sheaths, for practical application to the concrete, the general truths ascertained by Buḍḍhi ?), 'this is certain, and easy to secure.'

The distinction between Mānasa and Manas, again, is that all volitions, kāmanā, wishings, longings, are formed, pictured, ideated, in Manas; while apprehension, grāhakaṭva, of them is in Mānasa (*i.e.*, cognizance of these desires, preliminary to the application, for their fulfilment, of the knowledge gained from Buḍḍhi). Manas is also called Kāma for this same reason. Kāmanā, craving, arises from experience of sense-objects through the senses. Hence all obstructions and hindrances, vighna, (to spiritual progress in renunciation) arise from Kāma-manas. It is the Mānasa which discriminates between the good and the evil that are both equally part of Sva-bhāva.[1] And therefore all objects (and courses of action) that are presented to

---

[1] In modern Samskṛṭ mānasam, manas, svānṭam, hṛṭ, etc., are all regarded as synonyms. But the text, which, by the way, uses the word in the masculine gender as mānasaḥ, gives it the special characteristic of 'reasoning conscience.'

the Manas should be examined by means of the Mānasa, in the light of the Buḍḍhi, to ascertain which are good and which are evil.

Here (in the region of Manas) separateness prevails; all things are perceived by it as separate from each other; and its own activities also, accordingly, take the dual form of saṅkalpa and vikalpa ('may I become this, or do this' and 'may I not become or do this, but something else'). By means of this is effected the evolution and involution, anuvarḍhana and praṭi-varḍhana, of all creation. Indeed, as is commonly said, 'The world is based on saṅkalpa and vikalpa'.

The Trinity has its correspondence here too; and the three together (*viz.*, Buḍḍhi, Mānasa and Manas?), regarded as one, are designated the Kāraṇa-sharīra.

After this comes the Sūkṣhma-sharīra. The results of good and evil, righteousness and wrong-doing, merit and sin, are experienced herein. It has five sub-divisions: prāṇa, apāna, vyāna, uḍāna, and samāna. A triple sub-division may also be discerned here like that of the Kāraṇa-sharīra. There is a reflexion, ābhāsa, of the five (prāṇas) in the liṅga-body also, which, indeed may be regarded as the product of the five dwelling in

the sūkṣhma-body[1].

Finally, the kārya-prakāsha, the expression, of the activity of the three, kāraṇa, sūkṣhma and liṅga, may be regarded as the Sṭhūla.

Such, in brief summary, is the human creation. And the moral of the tale is: Understand all facts of all the World-process in terms of the Trinity of the A U M, and understanding them thus, do your duty peacefully in all situations, and accomplish all objects.

---

[1] Prāṇa, in the sense of vital power, is the element of desire—the only *Force* in the world—and appears everywhere, on all planes. The triads, the pentads, the septenates may be traced endlessly in all bodies, planes, worlds, systems, etc. In the sūkṣhma-sharīra, the five prāṇas, at least in one aspect, are the vital currents belonging to the five sensors which have their 'centres' in the astral body; the five commonly known prāṇas, of current Samskṛṭ works are corresponding forces, working as motors in the etheric body, and so on.

SECTION V.

Manṭavy-āmanṭavya-prakaraṇa.

WHAT TO APPROVE AND WHAT TO DISAPPROVE.

Co-ordination of apparently conflicting views by considerations of relativity to time, space and circumstances.—Subservience to evolutional ideal the one test of right conduct.—The 'example' of the hierarchs.—Can a jīva that has attained the knowledge of Brahman do wrong?.—The moral bearing, distinguished from the purposive significance, of the sacraments.—Mutual love and service the one law for all.—The explanation of the fact of hate and mutual warfare.—The proper food of man.—The reconciliation of all opinions.

The summing up of all things whatsoever that form subject of speech or thought, the complete unification of all knowledge, follows upon a discussion of the details. Such discussion is possible only by means of question and answer, challenger and opponent, thesis and anti-thesis, briefly, the well-known 'two sides of every question.' That every question has two sides is the direct consequence of the fact that every affair to which a question can relate is made up of the Self and the Not-Self, the One and the Many. When we have examined both

these two sides and realised that they are inseparable, that the whole truth combines both, then only have we summed up the whole universe, then only do we know what to believe and what to not believe, what to accept and what to reject, what to do and what to avoid doing; then we know that there is really nothing that is inherently and absolutely praiseworthy or blameworthy, sinful or meritorious, true or false, right or wrong, approvable or condemnable; then we realise that we have to discard the erstwhile true and embrace the erstwhile erroneous and *vice versa*, all according to differences of time, place, needs and circumstances.

For this reason does the *Nyāya* say that the siḍḍhānṭa, the final conclusion, can be established only by means of the ḍṛṣhtānṭa, the example, wherein both the parties concerned, the challenger and his opponent, the layman and the expert, are equally agreed. (Every conclusion, every particular and practical proposition—and these are judgments as to causal relation—involves a psychological and metaphysical process, wherein the mind has risen from one or more particular instances actually experienced to a universal proposition and descends again from that universal proposition to a particular instance; in other words

it involves both induction and deduction; and agreement is possible as to the final conclusion, the siḍḍhānṭa, only when there is agreement as to the particular instances actually experienced, the ḍṛṣhṭānṭa.)

Brahman is the siḍḍhānṭa in which all possible ḍṛṣhṭānṭas are included, and all differences are merged. Herein we see that all possible sides of every question are equally present; and the reconciliation is that what it is one's interest to believe and do in one situation it is another's interest to disbelieve and avoid doing in that situation, and *vice versa*; reverse the situation and the belief or disbelief, the act or its avoidance, are all reversed.

Having arrived at this conclusion and conviction, the jīva should, for the practical purposes of his own life-journey, study and imitate as far as possible the precept and example of the shiṣhta, 'the instructed,' 'those that have remained over' (from earlier evolutions, for the guidance of the newer).[1] These, the shiṣhta, are the hierarchs that guide and govern evolution. Their āchāra, example, 'conduct,' 'activity,' is that which helps on the succession of events

---

[1] See *The Science of Social Organisation, or The Laws of Manu in the Light of Theosophy*, pp. 7, 8.

constituting the evolution that they are concerned with; and it should be followed and imitated by the jīvas who have arrived at knowledge of Brahman. Among these hierarchs there is necessarily a unanimity of opinion, of precept and example, because they are governed by one predominant Unity. The discord, the sin, the ignoring and opposing of unity, that appears all around us in the world, even under the guidance of such unity-inspired hierarchs, is also all included within the unity, as the many, as an indispensable part of the whole scheme. For, truly, the *One* scheme is nothing else than the multiplication of the One into the Many, and the division and reduction of the Many into the One, the descent of spirit into matter, Self into Not-Self, and reascent thereof into itself, (or, it may even be said, of matter and Not-Self into spirit and Self).[1] To the limited and narrow view, the existence of sin and discord is an inexplicable disruption of and triumph over unity, a violation of times and needs that refutes and falsifies the statements made above; yet, to the wider vision that recognises the transcendental infinitude of times and needs, the fact of cyclic necessity in short, they appear as servants of that unity, as humble

---

[1] See *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, xiii. 30.

ministers of ever higher needs and laws and wider-reaching cycles—though, obviously, they are such servants and ministers *in and because of their aspect of* or *as sin* and *evil*, for that time, and cannot be called by any other name than sin and evil then.

But, if this be so, would it not be permissible for jīvas to choose deliberately the path of selfishness and sin and discord, as much as that of service, harmony and merit? The answer is twofold. In the first place, such *choice* is not possible in the nature of things. True and complete and successful deliberation, and Brahman-knowledge, imply each other. (The wise and the good are the same). And the knowledge of Brahman, the realisation of Its being, the identification with or approximation to Its Nature, in any jīva, implies and preassumes that certain experiences have been gone through and certain conditions fulfilled. After the undergoing of such experience and fulfilment of such conditions, the inevitable result is an indefeasible and ever-increasing tendency in the jīva to walk on the nivṛṭṭi-mārga, and always in the direction of unity and away from separateness; for belief and act, cognition and action, are inextricably related to each other, and every jīva must do what in its heart it knows to be truest and believes to be most

conducive to its happiness or pleasure. He who has achieved the *knowledge* of the All, the Whole, *after* finishing his course on the pravṛṭṭi-mārga must also *act* the All, the Whole, *i.e.*, behave unselfishly, altruistically, universally, and not selfishly and separately. This latter behavior is possible only to the jīva who is yet on the pravṛṭṭi-mārga, and cognises only the limited, the separate, who knows and feels himself as an individual opposed to other individuals, and not as the Universal embracing all individuals. We see thus that if sin and discord *are* included in the world-scheme, they are included *as the non-deliberate,* as the reasonless (irrational, non-ratio-cinated, relationless, law-less) many; therefore they cannot be chosen *deliberately* by any jīva *that knows,* but only blindly and under compulsion of personal desire by the jīva that does not really know. When we see a jīva that *speaks* as if he knew the All, and *acts* as if he felt only his little personal self, we are to infer that the *feeling* dominates, overwhelms and renders useless, abortive and as if nil, the *knowledge*; or rather indeed we are to infer that the true knowledge has not yet arisen in the jīva; briefly, that the passage from the path of pursuit to that of renunciation has not yet been effected, that the gateway of vairāgya which stands

at the junction-point between the two arcs of descent and reascent has not been crossed.

The second answer would be that even if such a deliberate choice of the life and line of sin and discord by a knower *were* possible, there would be no serious harm done; because that life and line carry unavoidably their own consequences of punishment and misery, and these also would be known to the knower, and he would walk towards and suffer them with open eyes, and so again wipe out his sin and discord.

Because of the facts embodied in the first answer is it ordained that, normally, jīvas should study the fourteen *Brahma-viḍyās* during brahma-charya, as the first stage of life and then pass on to the other stages, successively.

The obvious dependence of one jīva on another is conclusive proof of their unity as well as separateness, this being the result of causeless Svabhāva. For while each successive particular event, each existence from non-existence, each non-existence from existence, has a cause, the whole endless series in its totality has no cause, but is only Svabhāva, the Absolute Nature of Brahman. This mixture of opposites, one and many, *is* the World-process; and out of this compound, this mutual relatedness and interdependence of smallest

and greatest, nearest and farthest, easiest and sternest, highest and lowest, arise the facts of sin and merit, of virtue and vice, absence of morality and false, conventional, adulterous or changeful morality, ā c h ā r a, a n ā c h ā r a, n i r ā c h ā r a and v y a b h i c h ā r a, all having their proper places in the world-scheme together with their appropriate consequences.

The sacraments, s a m s k ā r a s, spoken of before, are included in ā c h ā r a, morality, ritual, rite, right conduct. As observed elsewhere they are indispensable in their s a ṭ or true form, for arousing and developing the mood and the faculty of introspection; their a s a ṭ or untrue form, or the external ceremonial, being, as it were, the u p ā ḍ h i, the sheath, of the former.

Because they are part of ā c h ā r a, therefore they come under the category of the m a n ṭ a v y a or the believable, the desirable, the advisable, the acceptable, the right and proper —the relative conditions of appropriate time, place, circumstances, being always premised.

After initiation by means of the sacraments, and the acquisition of knowledge consequent thereon, the ideation, the consideration of alternative plans, and finally the formation, materialisation or realisation, s a ṅ k a l p a n a, v i k a l p a n a, and p r a k a l p a n a, of new worlds becomes not only possible but a duty.

It may be noted that while the details of the sacraments differ with differing times, places and circumstances, the result, the purposive significance, is always the same. Thus, the significance of the sacrament of marriage is multiplication. We find this sacrament (mechanically, naturally,) undergone by minerals also, in the mineral kingdom downwards from the human. And in all these kingdoms the result is multiplication. But, of course, in the human kingdom, the significance is recognised self-consciously as it is not elsewhere; and from this fact there accrues an added excellence in the progeny of holy wedlock—to say nothing of the special perfections derived from the use of mantras—which is absent in the progeny of unconsecrated marriages. This is the real reason of the shame and blame attaching to illegitimacy; otherwise, indeed, all creatures, howsoever born, are forms of Brahman.

In all this we see that what is in accord, assonance and consonance, with the nature, the prakṛṭi, of a single jīva, or a community, or a nation, or a race, what helps on the feeling of the unity and continuity of the self of that jīva or community etc., is manṭavya, believable, proper, lawful, good, to it; while that which is opposed to its nature, threatens to disrupt its unity and continuity is a-manṭavya,

unbelievable, unacceptable, improper, unlawful, evil, wrong. Karṭavya and a-karṭavya, fit to do and to avoid, good act and evil act, duty and breach of duty—these follow upon the manṭavya and a-manṭavya. Actions in accordance with knowledge are duty; against it, opposed to and condemned by it, are the opposite.

All this is included in the AUM and classifiable under cognition, desire and action. For all shāsṭras, teachings, sciences, though all dealing with knowledge primarily, are yet subdivided according to these (as intellectual and scientific, or devotional and artistic, or ethical and practical). Thus, the sciences that are concerned with the determination of the nature of the Self are pre-eminently cognitional or intellectual; so others with regard to kriyā, or ichchhā, are of the other kinds.

To the jīva that knows all this, service of all beings is the only and the inevitable activity or occupation left, and such service is indeed the Sanāṭana Ḍharma, the one Eternal Law —the law of love and service of all beings.

It is true that hate also exists, and the sense and fact of separateness, in conseqence of which one jīva does and indeed must devour another if it is to maintain its own life. But here also Necessity and Nature are ever turning evil into

good and manufacturing new **upāḍhis**, by propagation and multiplication of the nourished with the help of those destroyed for the nourishment of these others. The preliminary slaughter is evil, but the subsequent assimilation is good; and each brings with it its own appropriate consequences. Thus closely are good and evil allied. The vegetable eats the vegetable (and the mineral), the animal eats it as well as the animal, the human eats these again, in turn. The series of anna, eatables, is thus unbroken.[1] The

[1] The series may be extended by saying, as is said in some of the more mystic passages of the *Upanishats*, that the human is food for the ḍeva, and so on. To understand this, we should have to think in terms of planes other than the physical, of a way of eating less patent than swallowing bodily. We do not find this subtler way of nourishment absent even from the physical plane. The vegetable nourishing the animal with the oxygen it gives off and the animal in turn nourishing the vegetable with the carbonic acid gas it throws out are illustrations of this unbroken series of mutual anna and nourishment, in accordance with the metaphysical law that an eṭaṭ is rejected by one aham and taken up by another, and *vise versa*. The exchange between the human and the ḍeva is apparently in terms of astral and mental matter. The lower and grosser ḍevas, yakshas, rākshasas, pishāchas, incubi and succubi, that crowd the noisome dens of

true law thereof is that that which helps on the work, the natural and proper function, of a creature, and does not hinder it, is that creature's proper a n n a or food. Proper and improper

---

vice, that revel in places of slaughter and hover ever round the sinful and the criminal, absorb and thrive on the astral effluvia that are the result of every surge of evil emotion and its accompanying nerve-vibration and nerve-dissolution. The higher tribes correspondingly subsist on the finer emanations of the better emotions. The highest gods subsist on 'devotion'. As the Marāthi proverb says देव भाव का भूखा, 'the ḍ e v a is hungry for emotion,' craves after 'feeling'; and the whole of Samskṛṭ theology is full of the fact that the higher gods are nourished by 'sacrifice'—in the higher and nobler sense. The human derives similar material from the ḍ e v a, as the *Gīṭā* says, परस्परं भावयंतः etc. iii. 11. Strictly speaking, the highest gods, the Chiefs of the hierarchs, belong to another kingdom, not the ordinary ḍ e v a kingdom, and if they are helped by devotion, the significance is somewhat different, but not altogether. Wars, epidemics, crimes, as well as waves of religious feeling, of science, of new civilisations, it will be seen in view of the above, profit directly, and may well be instigated and brought about by, the ḍ e v as of high and low degree, as is stated in the *Purāṇas*.

The paragraph of the text is a brief but sufficient statement of the practical application of the moral

food, eatable and uneatable, are thus again relative to special circumstances—as is most unmistakably seen in the case of illness. Therefore, to the human being who has realised that his main object in life, his one sole end and aim, his *summum bonum*, is the achievement of m u k ṭ i, the eating of animals is as much inappropriate as the eating of fellow-humans; for the double reason that there is specially-evolved p r ā ṇ a or life in them which ought not to be destroyed, and that the eating of animal food breeds animal tendencies in the eater and animalises his progeny. For out of the food are formed the sperm and the germ, the r e ṭ a s, and thence whole races, and so inappropriate food may hinder the fulfilment of the proper function of man, alluded to above.

(But would not the same arguments apply to the consumption of vegetable food? No, because vegetables have not *so much* life, nor *such* life as animals have. The element of e ṭ a ṭ predominates over the element of a h a m, in them, only a little less than in the minerals. They have not yet evolved to the same extent and in the same manner as animals. Their consciousness

---

significance of the 'Struggle for existence and survival of the fittest,' in their most elementary and *fundamental* forms, in respect of food, on the two paths, of pursuit and of renunciation.

is yet a sub-consciousness, their sensitiveness is yet vague and latent; they have not yet so much separate individuality as the animals, for they have not yet broken loose from the surface of mother earth as the animals have done, and do not possess an independently moving life to the same degree. They have not the pointedly selfish appetites and passions that the animals have, in whom the a h a m has begun to predominate over the e ṭ a ṭ; and the nature and quality of their life or p r ā ṇ a, in its power to nourish other life, is yet not far removed from the nature and quality of the general p r ā ṇ a-store of nature, *i.e.*, of the earth-globe. Hence the consumption of vegetable food by humans will not breed in them intense animal appetites and passions as the consumption of animal food will, and causes less pain, while it supports the life of the human body with equal effectiveness. Vegetable food is therefore the best food, next after the deriving of sustenance direct from the 'stores of nature, the earth and the sun'[1]—always, with the

[1] Instances of this direct sustenance are our breathing, and the incessant circulation through our bodies of the elements of ṭ e j a s and ā k ā s h a, which we do not even feel. The body made up of the five elements requires to be nourished incessantly by fresh supplies of them. Solid, liquid and gaseous foods correspond to p ṛ ṭ h v ī, j a l a and

qualification, 'for the seeker of mokṣha.' To humans having other objects in view, aggrandisement on the physical plane etc., and prepared to bear the consequences, other foods

---

vāyu. The need of sunlight for healthy growth is also recognised. By analogy, ākāsha must be even more indispensable. The subtler the food, the more incessantly and absolutely it is needed. In cases of trance, when even breathing stops, presumably ākāsha keeps up life.

It may be asked why, in a chapter on ethics, out of all possible subjects the subject of food-stuffs is selected for special discussion, a subject which is not even distantly touched in modern text-books on morals. The answer is that ethic is essentially concerned with giving and taking, appropriation and surrender, and the absorption or yielding up of life is the very essence of giving or taking. That the subject is ignored by modern text-books is due to the fact that their outlook on life is very different as a whole from that of a work like this; and, as a special case, the giving and taking with which they concern themselves, is what takes place between human and human at the most, sometimes the lower races of mankind being also excluded. But as that outlook changes, as the sweep of evolution is seen to include worlds invisible as well as the visible, as physical sciences are found to subserve the superphysical and metaphysical, as the inter-relation of physiological and psychological

would probably be more appropriate and effective.) The sin of h i m s ā, conscious and deliberate slaughter, is directly proportionate to the amount of the A h a m-element manifest in the organism slain.[1] Such slaughter by conscious human beings obstructs the normal evolution of the jīvas, slayer as well as slain. And whatever obstructs normal evolution, or the will of Brahmā, is sinful; and the opposite meritorious. To say that such slaughter must also be within the scheme of evolution and the will of Brahmā,

---

conditions is recognised more and more, the importance of 'diet' will also be realised more and more for psychical purposes as well as for those of physical health. The purer and finer the life that is sought to be lived, the body to be inhabited by the soul, the purer and finer must be the diet by which it is nourished. As said in *Light on the Path:* "He who desires to be karmaless" (in a comparative sense) "must look to the air for a home; and after that to the ether". Because the two appetites, for food and for progenition, are at the very root of the material life of the path of pursuit, great stress is laid on the gradual control and restraint of these, in the systems of y o g a and practical metaphysics which deal with the path of renunciation.

[1] See *The Science of the Emotions*, 2nd edition, p. 227; and *The Science of Social Organisation, or The Laws of Manu in the Light of Theosophy*, p. 293 and p. 299.

otherwise it would not take place, and therefore is not sinful—is not enough; the reply is that, if we must talk in such phrases, we can equally say that sin and obstruction and punishment must also then be within the same scheme and will.

All such considerations, of proper and improper, good and evil, right and wrong, sin and merit, harmony and discord, duty and failure, ḍoṣha and pradoṣha, puṇya and prapuṇya, ḍharma and aḍharma, svārṭha and parārṭha, selfishness and altruism—are all summed up in the words pravṛṭṭi and nivṛṭṭi and anuvṛṭṭi,[1] pursuit and renunciation and continuance. He who ponders diligently on these words will find all problems of practical ethics cleared up for him. So also will he find illumined and reconciled all theories whatsoever, for instance—to name only the more wide-reaching ones—the ārambha-vāḍa or the view that the world was created by an extra-cosmical personal deity; the pariṇāma-vāḍa, the view that it is the result of changes and transformations and evolutions in primitive substance due to chance or to the force of its own nature; the vi-varṭa-vāḍa, that it is an illusory appearance which is the

[1] Cf. *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, iii. 16, एवं प्रवर्त्तितं चक्रं नानुवर्त्तयतीह यः

'reverse,' the antithesis, of the Real; and the vi-pariṇāma, pari-varṭa, sam-pari-varṭa'[1] and other vāḍas without number. The jīva that has realised the endless round of pravṛṭṭi and nivṛṭṭi will see what the truth of each such view is, and at what stage in the jīva's cyclic life each necessarily arises. For he knows that all the *Shāsṭras*, all the ancient teachings, are in uttermost accord with one another, being only ideations of the different parts of one and the same world-plan, ideations by the different hierarchs, vested with different offices and functions, of one and the same Great Hierarchy of the Guides and Rulers of Evolution, all inspired unceasingly by and with the One Consciousness of Unity.

---

[1] The exact significance of these is not now known; only the other three views are mentioned in modern Samskṛṭ works. See *The Science of Peace*, ch. xi, p. 139. Also compare the English words, theism, deism, atheism, agnosticism, monism, materialism, spiritualism, idealism, realism, naturalism, henotheism, monotheism, polytheism, hylozoism, absolutism, etc., etc., as indicating various "views" of the World-process, all simply ringing changes on the Primal Trinity, *viz.*, the Relation (between) Self and Not-Self.

SECTION VI.

Mukṭi-Sāḍhanam.

THE ACHIEVEMENT OF FREEDOM.

The fruit of all this mental labor in metaphysic. Mokṣha.—Its nature.—Its further consequence. Yoga.—Its significance.—Divine vision and illumination.—Their literal and metaphysical meaning.—The *rationale* thereof.—The worlds of the ideal and the real, mental and material, subtle and gross, inner and outer, and the third or universal.—Corresponding sub-divisions under cognition, desire and action.—The realisation of the third of each triplet of sub-divisions as equivalent to mokṣha by yoga.—Subservience of the six *Upāṅgas.*—Relativity of banḍha and mokṣha, bondage and freedom.—Sin and merit as the two sub-divisions of bondage.—The essential significance of karma.—Reward and punishment.—Retrospective effects.—Other sub-divisions of karma.—Origin of evil.—Distribution of effects by means of the group-soul.—Pleasure, Pain and Peace.—AUM.

What is the fruit of all this immense mental industry, this labor and travail of thought? The thought itself is ample answer to this question. There is no fruit, indeed, from the

universal or transcendental standpoint (from which there is no labor either); and, or but, from the limited or empirical point of view (that of the individual jīva), this knowledge itself, namely, that there is no fruit, is the fruit. The realisation that the jīva never had any want to fulfil is the fulfilment of whatever inmost want it suffered from. This is the essential nature of mokṣha, as must be clear abundantly to whosoever has undergone that labor and travail of thought. Mokṣha is the fruit of this whole science, and of all the sciences subsidiary to and comprehended within it, metaphysical, physical and practical or yogic. To know and feel and show in act that 'separateness is not,' is mokṣha.

Having achieved mokṣha, again, the jīva knows that from the universal standpoint there is neither bandha nor mokṣha, neither bondage nor liberation therefrom. The condition of the jīva on the path of pursuit, the pravṛṭṭi-mārga, is the condition of bondage; that on the path of renunciation, the nivṛṭṭi-mārga, of freedom.

How can there be 'movelessness,' 'unshaken peace,' in *such* mokṣha, every moment and every instant of being on a *path* meaning change? The answer is contained in the two words, 'by predominance.' The predominance of the

consciousness of unity over the consciousness of separateness makes m o k ṣ h a.

The full realisation of all this significance of the Logion, AUM, which constitutes m o k ṣ h a, is achievable only by a b h y ā s a, 'sitting close,' 'persistence,' 'repeated' practice. Such a b h y ā s a is y o g a. Y o g-ā b h y ā s a is nothing else than the acquisition of the knowledge of the ideation which is the foundation of, and indeed is, the World-process, and then the putting of that knowledge into practice. This y o g a has therefore obviously many a ṅ g a s, 'limbs,' parts, departments, and, indeed, all the sciences whatsoever, p a ḍ ā r ṭ h a-s h ā s ṭ r a, material or physical science, and s h i l p a-s h ā s ṭ r a, the science or rather the art of construction of all kinds—all these are subservient to it.

From another standpoint, a b h y ā s a requires and implies exercise of s h a k ṭ i, power, energy, which includes everything; and yet again, it is k r i y ā, activity, whereby everything is manifested.

For all such reasons, y o g a is the principal a ṅ g a, organ, means and instrument of m o k ṣ h a, without which freedom cannot be achieved. The divine vision, ḍ i v y a-ḍ ṛ ṣ h t i, said to be developed in and by y o g a, in its true metaphysical and universal significance, is the great vision of the Unity of the Self. The

other merely superphysical meanings assigned to the expression are comparative and particular and limited.

The further product of this fruit of mokṣha is the bringing of it to other jīvas.

When mokṣha is accomplished, all, everything, the most distant, most dissimilar, disconnected and incongruous facts of the World-process, are seen as organically co-ordinated. It is true that the details are governed by an-avasṭhā, non-finality, endlessness, such as may not be compassed and fully grasped in its totality by any one jīva at any one time and space, but the jīva that has accomplished freedom has seen that all this an-avasṭhā is due to and is comprehended in the Negation. The individual buḍḍhi grasps not the whole of this endlessness; nor manas; it may not be measured by knowledge or by action, or by time, or by space; it is indescribable, indeed, incomprehensible, from the lower standpoint. How the atom, limited because it is a 'this,' contains the infinite Self; how again it is, though limited, divisible infinitely; how the Self confined in one atom is yet present in all other atoms too; how an atom present in one world acts in and upon things in another world —all this is truly unintelligible from that lower standpoint, but it is plain as day to the

unrestricted outlook of the Universal Self. As the large is, so is the small, and *vice versa;* and all are truly inseparably related and all behave similarly, in the broader view.

Because of this similarity in diversity is there a heredity and the qualities of parents are transmitted to their children; because of it can the character and the conduct of the parents be inferred from the appearance of the progeny; or the nature of one spouse from the looks of the other; or the medical history of a whole family from the appearance of any one member. Because of this can a practical and expert psychologist deduce the ethical nature of a man, or a well-trained architect, who is master of his science, the nature of the buildings and surroundings inhabited or required by that man, from his mere appearance. Because of this connexion of everything with everything along an endless and endlessly arranged and ordered chain and relation of cause and effect, all and every science is possible and has some truth in it (*e.g.*, cheiromancy, physiognomy, phrenology, etc.) however weird and unfamiliar at first sight it may seem.

Thus, from the one point of view, *i.e.*, that of diversity in unity, we have a pseudo-infinite perplexity of detail; while, from the other, *i.e.*, that of unity in diversity, we have one clear,

systematic or indeed partless whole.

By imitation and reflexion, in the concrete and limited and successive, of these two points of view and of their consequences—both equally dealt with by metaphysic—we are always having, in individual experience, the two worlds of inner and outer, ideal and real, thought and thing, mental and sensuous, causal and effectual, etc., corresponding to the I and the This. These two ever exist in one way or another, even in the minerals, indeed in every atom, though the fact be not very manifest. To these two worlds there correspond, in the human kingdom, the sṭhūla and the liṅga sheaths or bodies, the former being the external and denser, the latter internal and subtler. But, it should be noted carefully, this series of inner and outer is also endless, and as the sṭhūla is to the liṅga, so is the latter to the sūkshma, and so on. The completing third (of this pair of inner and outer, sṭhūla and liṅga) is the (world or body of) universality, all-consciousness, describable by, and corresponding to, the Negation, and holding together and merging into each other the other two[1]. The three are

[1] See pp. 281, *et seq.* of *The Science of Peace.* At first sight there seems to be some inconsistency between these statements and the current *names* given to the bodies. Thus kāraṇa-sharīra is the

as externality, internality and relativity or mutuality, (or outside, inside and substance).

Under cognition, these three are reproduced as (1) sensation or cognition proper, (2) memory and its modifications, all thought, and

---

fourth in the series of sṭhūla, liṅga, sūkshma, kāraṇa, etc.; but it means, etymologically and obviously, the *causal* body. Should not the names have rather been sṭhūla, sṭhūla-kāraṇa or liṅga, liṅga-kāraṇa or sūkshma, sūkshma-kāraṇa or kāraṇa proper, (see footnote Vol. II, p. 44, *supra*) etc.? Possibly the explanation is that, at the present stage of evolution, the three lower upāḍhis, sṭhūla, liṅga and sūkshma, are already beginning to be lumped up and merged into one, and the kāraṇa is so called because it is now the receptacle of the germs whence the three lower bodies are repeatedly generated, and also of all karmic causes. When this causal body, with more familiar knowledge and use of it, begins to partake of the character of the 'effect'-bodies, then, it is possible that the *name* of kâraṇa may again be slided onwards also. There is an advantage in keeping the name, a name like this, a step in advance of the fact, in order to keep the intellect and evolutionary energy of the jīva on the stretch. As a fact we meet already with mention of the buḍḍhic, ṭurīya, or mahâ-kāraṇa body; and another still finer, the āṭmic or nirvāṇic, and so on.

(3) the continuum of consciousness, the unbroken thread and net-work of knowledge. The ever-present endlessness of all things appears here also, as everywhere, in the shape of memory within, or of memory, cognition of cognition *i.e.*, apperception, etc.

Under desire, the corresponding forms are (1) the This-desire, the outer, manifested, and effective desire which prevails (over other desires) and guides the action of the physical body, (2) the I-desire, hidden, suppressed and concealed for the time being, not taking effect in outer life, but registered in the inner body, (often the very opposite of the outer and manifested desire, and changing places with it, that is, becoming effective, later on—as will appear in a moment in connexion with the discussion of sin and merit), (3) the absence of either, mere universal and incessant necessity—whence the saying that the knower has no desires, but subsists in and by necessity.

Action has also, of course, similar subdivisions, of inner, outer and all-embracing. (1) The outer action is obvious, it is the execution of (2) the inner determination, resolution; (3) the third is the universal, pseudo-infinite and pseudo-eternal movement of I and This governed by Negation, that incessant birth and life and death and absence and rebirth which

ignores and yet includes all individual will and initiation and determination and execution, etc.

To realise this third of each triplet as including the other two is m o k ṣ h a; and this, as said before, is possible only by y o g-ā b h y ā s a. "From the *Veḍānṭa* learn to *know finally* and exactly the nature of the I and of the This; learn the work, activity, *mentality* or *intention* of the two from the *Mīmāmsā*; learn their multifarious manifestations in their separate *marshalling* and *leading forth* from *Nyāya*; learn the mutual reflexion and re-reflexion, the classification and arrangement and systematisation, of all these *special manifestations* from the *Vaisheṣhika*; learn their inner *unity* from *Yoga*; then realise their endlessness *passing* all *count* or *number* with the help of *Sāṅkhya*; and finally become *Veḍa*-m a y a, full of *knowledge*, omniscient, B r a h m a n itself—This is m o k ṣ h a."[1]

From the universal standpoint, no effort is needed for m o k ṣ h a any more than for b a n ḍ h a. Both are 'necessary' and must succeed each other, in the ordinary course, as ought to be clear from the statement already made, that the one corresponds to the path of renunciation and the other to that of pursuit,

[1] The italicised words indicate the meaning of the names of the systems of philosophy.

and that in reality both are naught. Both are halves, in the one successive world-scheme, and follow each other in unceasing rotation. The counsel that is given to jīvas, especially when they are near the turning-point, to strive after liberation, is appropriate only from the limited standpoint of the successive. Thus the *Brahma-Sūṭra* says: So long as the scheme of world-experience is not fully known, so long is there bondage for the jīva; and again: All-knowledge is mokṣha. This all-knowledge is gained only by exertion, from the standpoint of the individual.

Banḍha and mokṣha being thus seen to be relative to each other, we further find that, by the usual correspondence of the Self and the Not-Self, banḍha is of two kinds, while mokṣha has none, or rather is itself the third kind, corresponding as it does with the Negation. (These two kinds of bondage will appear in a moment as corresponding with puṇya and pāpa, sin and merit, or they may be regarded as sub-conscious and conscious, as follows.)

So long as the knowledge or rather the consciousness of the I is less than that of the This or even equal to it, equally balanced and therefore neutralised by it, so long there is banḍhana, bondage. But this is an unfelt, a

subconscious bondage, and therefore, in one sense, not a bondage at all. When however the inner I begins to prevail over the outer This, when self-consciousness sprouts forth, when the I begins to be more aware of itself than of the This, then there arises the consciousness of bondage, the sense of limitation by the body and its surroundings, and concomitantly with it the consciousness of the possibility of freedom; and fretting and chafing against the former, the j ī v a wishes and hopes and strives for the latter. Side by side with the appearance of this special consciousness of bondage, this knowledge of limitation, arises k a r m a in the special human sense. Because minerals, vegetables, animals, (certain kinds of) ḍ e v a s and the earlier races of man do not possess this self-consciousness, therefore they have no sense of bondage or of freedom and create no k a r m a and suffer no consequences in the special sense. These are felt and suffered only by humans and, amongst them too, only by such as have arrived at the stage of knowledge above referred to.[1]

[1] Like so many other statements, this must be regarded as comparative. Many animals show more than a glimmer of the law of cause and effect. A dog here and there seems fully aware and shows all the marks of shame at having done wrong. Such

(The speciality of human karma and of its consequence, reward or punishment, consists simply and purely in this addition of *self-consciousness*, and in nothing else. This addition to either side of the equation *appears* as deliberation, volition, free choice, on the one side, the side of karma, and as expected result, known beforehand and all along, on the other side, the side of phala, fruit and consequence, reward and punishment. This is all the significance of the statements that this world, the human world, is karma-bhūmi, the place of karma, that the human body is karma-kshetra, the field of karma, that the elemental ḍevas, chanḍrāṭmā, etc., that are in line with and anterior to the human kingdom in order of evolution have to be born as humans before they can secure mokṣha. These statements do not and cannot mean that there is any modification of the one universal

---

may be said to be near the point when the latent germ of individuality will appear as sprout above the surface, when the animal will individualise into the man with glimmerings of self-consciousness. Compare the statements of *The Secret Doctrine*, that the causal body descended into (*i.e.*, developed in) men about the middle of the third Root-Race, after which they fell into sin and bondage, and before which they were innocent.

law of causation regarded as action and re-action for the special behoof of the human kingdom. Karma in the general sense of causal action has its consequence in reaction-effect in all the kingdoms whatsoever, just as much as, and neither more nor less than, in the human kingdom; the distinctive peculiarity of it in the human kingdom is that there is a *consciousness* attaching to it as well as to its consequence, a co-efficient on both sides of the equation. An animal as much as a human will receive pain if it give pain and receive pleasure if it give pleasure; but in the case of the animal the giving of pain or pleasure may be called a mechanical cause and the receiving of pain or pleasure a mechanical effect, whereas in the case of the human, the cause is called conscious sin or merit and the effect conscious punishment or reward.)

Corresponding to the bondage that is no bondage, (for lack of ability to contrast it with freedom) of the earlier kingdoms and stages of evolution on the arc of pursuit, we have that bondage (or non-freedom) that also is no-bondage (or freedom), because undertaken freely as duty, of the later kingdoms and stages of evolution on the arc of renunciation. In this sense, jīvan-mukṭas, jīvas that have turned the junction-point between the two arcs and

have thus attained m o k ṣ h a, continue *bound* to work, in the universal and impersonal sense, that is to say, bound to work for the sake and the helping of other j ī v a s; they cease from k a r m a only in the sense of personal selfish k a r m a.

This kind of b a n ḍ h a—which indeed is equivalent to m o k ṣ h a and can be distinguished from it only when the latter is for the time regarded exclusively in the aspect of identity with Negation—may be regarded as illustrating and justifying in one way the relativity, stated before, of b a n ḍ h a and m o k ṣ h a, which relativity requires that they should follow in rotation upon each other. But that relativity is realised in a more literal sense also, for when one cycle is completed and after the due period of p r a l a y a is over, and the time for a new succession, a new cycle, arrives, then the m u k ṭ a s of previous cycles are bound again. For p r a v a r ṭ a n a, going forth, pursuing, corresponding to k r i y ā, and n i v a r ṭ a n a, returning, renouncing, corresponding to p r a ṭ i-k r i y ā, and a n u v a r ṭ a n a, following out, going round and round, (corresponding to v i-k r i y ā or rather u p a-k r i y ā), or, in other words, u ṭ p a ṭ ṭ i, n ā s h a n a, and s ṭ h i ṭ i, birth, death, and life —these constitute the triple incessant and universal k a r m a of the World-process in which

all and everyone must share, whether freed or bound, mineral or omniscient. K a r m a, in the special sense, begins with man because and when there is a preponderance in him of j ñ ā n a-s a ṭ ṭ v a and therefore of discrimination between the Self and the Not-Self.

As to the relation between k a r m a and p h a l a, action and its consequence, every action reacts upon its originator, for the plain reason that the cause is present in the effect, the actor in the work. All the transformations of the work affect the originator in consequence of this indefeasible relation.[1]

---

[1] This is only one of the many instances of the author's apparent inconsequences, or at least very startling transitions, of thought, where to the unalert reader there appears to be a complete shifting of ground. A little more careful scrutiny discloses the real connexion. As the text stands here, it does not appear, *prima facie*, to have much meaning. But take these illustrations. An architect constructs a building; it looks very fine, he acquires fame; a generation later the foundation begins to give way, the reputation begins to suffer; or it is found inadequate for the purpose for which it was intended; the dwelling-house is too hot in the summers and too cold in the winters, for sun and shade have not been duly provided for, or the lecture-room gives a bad echo because acoustic principles have not been properly observed; for

But is not this the case with minerals, vegetables, etc., also? It is so most surely; only the predominance in them of the This, as said before, prevents the development of the *feeling* of 'actor-ness', of a h a m-k ā r a, 'I do,' 'I act,' to the requisite point, and therefore the *special significance* of k a r m a and p h a l a remains latent. It is also true that the latent may be perceived, may be discovered by means of inference, and may then be stated as an existing fact; but in the first place this has not always a practical use, and, in the second place, is not always possible either, when the latent

---

all these reasons the architect's reputation suffers retrospectively. Or, again, a statesman, a minister, advocates a certain administrative measure, or succeeds in getting passed a certain law, or throws his country into a certain war; at the time, each one appears desirable or just or profitable to the country, and the statesman or minister wins fame and popularity with the public; but, in the course of years, unexpected and evil consequences ensue from his measures and the country suffers loss; his reputation suffers equally; the future historian condemns him as incapable, as short-sighted, or as interested. In the *Purāṇas* there are statements to the effect that j ī v a s suffer in n a r a k a or enjoy in s v a r g a so long as their evil or good actions are remembered here on earth. (See *The Science of the Emotions*, 2nd edn., pp. 74, 75.)

facts are overpoweringly dominated by and enveloped in the Negation. (It should be remembered that argument and analogy are also all ultimately founded on and start from a basis of some pratyaksha, some sensuous fact, or other.)

Because the human is entitled, as well as subject, to karma and phala in the special sense, therefore is the direction or advice given to him to strive after, to achieve, Brahman.

Human karma may be sub-divided into two kinds: (1) the (self-seeking) karma that binds, (2) the (self-sacrificing) karma that frees. The former is all action done with the consciousness of and tending to strengthen further the connexion between the I and the This; the latter is that which is performed under the consciousness of the Negation. In other words, the one is performed under the consciousness of the separateness of jīvas, each being regarded as indissolubly connected with its upāḍhi or enveloping sheath; the other is performed with the consciousness of the Oneness of all.

From one standpoint, that of effectiveness or the successful achievement of the purpose immediately aimed at, either of these two kinds may be sub-divided further into (1) exactly appropriate or yukṭa, (2) inappropriate or

a-yukṭa, (3) helpful or upa-yukṭa. But a far more important sub-division for practical, *i.e.*, ethical, purposes is that already briefly alluded to before, *viz.*, of the karma that binds into (1) pāpa or sin, corresponding to U and (2) puṇya or merit, corresponding to A, the third of the triplet being (3) the kārya or duty that frees, corresponding with M. In terms of the logion, I-This-I is puṇya, This-I-This is pāpa, and Not-This-I is mokṣha.

The consequence of puṇya or meritorious action is sukha, pleasure, joy or happiness, to the actor; whereas that of pāpa or sin is ḍuhkha, pain, sorrow or misery. Ordinarily of course pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, are opposed to each other, as much as sin and merit; but, in the ultimate essence, they are forms or transformations of each other, even as sin and merit are; by the metaphysical law, each hides its opposite within itself, and is therefore in a sense identical with it. This may be inferred from the fact that the very same circumstances that are pleasurable to one person at any one time are painful to another person at that same time and again painful to that same person at another time. The explanation of all this is to be found in the fact of the underlying unity of the Self, temporarily broken up by the manyness of the bodies. The jīva

that gives a pleasure to another jīva gives the pleasure to himself; so the pain also, which he gives to another, he gives in reality to himself; and therefore the pleasure and the pain come back to him at a later time. These very facts of the Unity of the I, and the identification of the I and the This, and the This and the I, are the reason why there is a reaction to every action.[1]

But how is it possible for the Self ever to find any satisfaction in giving pain to itself, and how, therefore, do any evil actions take place at all? How should the Self even bear the sight, the thought, of pain to itself, much less cause it?

[1] The carrying out of this metaphysical law in terms of matter is effected, it would seem, by means of the registration in the superphysical bodies corresponding with the supraliminal consciousness, of the parties concerned, of their mutual debts and assets and the readjustment of the latter, from the Central Chief Court in the heart of the Sun, (the Hiraṇyagarbha, the Ruler of our System, whose Individuality unifies us all, as cells in an individual organism), or corresponding lower centres in the various planets (like the nerve-ganglia whence reflex action takes place—the brain being the overlord of them all—as our Yama, judge of souls, is a son of the Sun) by means of a special class of rays, rashmi, referred to in the *Upaniṣhaṭs*. (See the commentary called *Paramārṭha-prapā*, by Sūrya Ḍaivajña on the *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*).

Should not compassion and sweet sympathy alone prevail everywhere in the circumstances mentioned? True; but it is just because and when the Self is excessively identified with a sheath, a body, a piece of the Not-Self, and therefore loses the consciousness of its unity with all jīvas and regards itself as separate from them, that hate and selfishness and sin arise; such a self feels that its pleasures can be secured only by snatching from, and not derived by sharing with, others; to it the pain of another is a means to its own pleasure. It is such jīvas, when at the climax of their egoism, that are described as "the asaj-jana, ḍur-jana, who by their causeless hatred are a source of terror to all beings, and in whose mouth the cruel and injurious word of evil power ever dwells, as venom in the fang of the serpent".

The excessive predominance of the This, the body, is the general cause of the nature becoming so full of hate that special causes are no longer needed to excite it; this is the significance of the adjective causeless here. But even such natures are not wholly bereft and abandoned of the benignity of the Self. For have they not also friends amongst congenial jīvas? It is true that because of their trustless and untrustworthy nature they make no friends amongst the good men, and the

world at large regards them as unfriendly; but evil men are the friends of evil men, for the fulfilment of each other's needs; and though the mutual help and association be for nefarious purposes only, yet, still, *as* mutual help and *association* it indicates that ruling majesty, that gracious mercy, of the Self which alone makes human life and intercourse, indeed any life, possible, and transmutes evil into good. For, surely, so far as evil men help each other they are good to each other. On the other hand, the This, the Not-Self, too, will not be ignored, and as the Self produces good out of all evil things, so this creates a semblance of evil in the good. Thus the men whom the world recognises as good men, the ṛṣhis, maha-ṛṣhis, munis, brāhmaṇas, etc., have to set themselves against the evil ones and thwart their wishes and cause them pain, regarding them as separate; so that to the evil the good behave as evil. So, again, if a physician, in endeavoring to cure a patient, administers in good faith a medicine which unfortunately happens to have too strong an effect and to kill him, the physician incurs no sin although he has given pain, but rather gains puṇya because of his endeavor to cure. On the other, hand, to give food to those who have already eaten their fill is in reality an act of sin though apparently one of charity. Yet again,

no person dies till his time comes in accordance with his own past karma, but if he should die by the deliberate act of another, be slain wrongfully by another, though that slaying be in accordance with that karma, yet that other will have incurred sin also. Natural death is called maraṇa, unnatural death hanana. The difference between the two is simply this, that the one is brought about by subtle and less-known causes, and the other by gross and known ones. To take one more instance: tears overflow out of the excess of joy as well as sorrow. In the one case the pity is for others who are not so happy as ourselves and with whom we would like to share our joy; in the other, the pity is for our own unhappy inferiority which needs to be and may be helped by others who have more than we. Thus intricately interlaced are the opposites everywhere, always passing by invisible gradations, the one into the other, always eluding and evading the close scrutiny, although, to the superficial view, they appeared to have well-marked differences.[1]

---

[1] Compare the *Bhagavaḍ-Gīṭā*, verse ii. 28: "The beginning and the end, the birth and the death, the source and the mergence, of things are, and are in the, in-de-finite. Their middle condition only is apparently definite." "From the great deep to the great deep he goes".

From all the above it is obvious that, generally speaking, joy, love, virtue, altruism, and svarga or heaven go together; and sorrow, hate, vice, selfishness, and naraka or purgatory form the opposite group; while mokṣha, peace, niṣh-kāma karma or desireless duty (*i.e.*, duty which is free from all *selfish* desire) and all-inclusiveness are different from both.

It has been said that sin and merit both bind the jīva to the World-process. This probably requires a brief word of explanation. For, apparently, acts of merit may be regarded as having the effect of emancipation. But this is not so. Even in the act of merit (as distinguished from the act of duty) the sense of separateness is present. It is much more present in the act of sin, truly; but it is present in the other also. It is predominantly present in sin; subordinately so in merit. The sense of the unity of the Self, which prevails in the latter, does so instinctively, sub-consciously, so to say; not deliberately, with conscious realisation, as in mokṣha. Hence, while this fact shows how virtue is the indispensable threshold of the abode of mokṣha, it also shows that virtue is not identical with mokṣha. In the act of merit, the helper, the giver, feels that he is giving to *another*; and the helped, the receiver, similarly feels that he has received from *another*. This is

the manifest feeling on both sides; (and corresponding to it is the unmanifested, the sub-conscious feeling—due to the Necessity of Unity and balance in supersession and rectification of the illusion of separateness, 'the feeling of *another*', and the disturbance of the balance—that 'I shall get back, later on, what I have given now,' on the one side, and that 'I shall pay back, later on, what I have taken now,' on the other); and these saṅkalpas, inner resolutions, bind both parties to the chain of karma. The binding in the case of acts of sin is obvious. In mokṣha, on the other hand, (the conscious and the sub-conscious have merged into one, and) the deliberate feeling is that I give only to my-Self and take only from my-Self; (and thus no new karma, in the special human sense, is created by the mukṭa, and the chain of the old prārabḍha is gradually exhausted and worn out.

From another standpoint it may be said that while pāpa or sin implies svārṭha or selfishness in the fullest sense, namely, of the sense of separate personality narrowed down to its extreme point, puṇya or merit or parārṭha *i.e.*, altruism or unselfishness is only the larger selfishness that works for the well-being of a whole 'group-soul', (whence we have such phases and phrases as parochialism, provincialism,

patriotism, nationalism, humanism, etc., all contrasted with, and yet possessing a common feature also with, individualism). The fact of the 'spreading' of karma is brought about by the presence of this group-soul.[1] Within the limits of each such sūṭrāṭmā, each and all are responsible for the good and evil acts of each and all, and the father's sins are visited on the children, or the latter reap the reward of the former's good deeds.[2] It is the existence of this group-soul also, with its consequent action and reaction on many of the acts of one, which makes mutual advice, counsel, instruction, consultation and remonstrance, and the formation of alliances, etc., not only possible but necessary, as more than once stated before. Hence also the reiterated injunction to seek good and avoid evil company, except when there is a need to cure the evil and

---

[1] See *The Science of Social Organisation*, p. 291.

[2] Many branches of national and international law, regarding inheritance and succession, torts and liabilities of third parties, responsibilities of governments and nations to each other for acts of subjects etc., are illustrations of this.

In Saxon times, in England, every village was held responsible for the misdeeds of its individual inhabitants. In modern days, in India, extra police are quartered on a whole town if a few inhabitants how any unusual spirit of disorderliness.

one's ability to do so is certain. M o k ṣ h a, on the other hand, is the universalism which includes both individualism and limited communism; it is the p a r a m-ā r ṭ h a which assimilates both s v-ā r ṭ h a and p a r-ā r ṭ h a.

It has been said before that s v a r g a and n a-r a k a correspond to pleasure and pain, to merit and sin, respectively. In one sense, therefore they are both only 'internal', like the others. In terms of the Logion, moreness, ā ḍ h i k y a, the predominance of the I over the This is s v a r g a; and conversely, the moreness or predominance of the This over the I is n a r a k a. But, in another sense, because there is always an external corresponding to an internal, therefore they are definite localities also, Kāma-loka etc. Ordinarily, it is true, the consequences are expressed in the same terms as the acts, s ṭ h ū l a of s ṭ h ū l a, s ū k s h m a of s ū k s h m a; the rewards or punishments of physical merits or sins are enjoyed or suffered in a physical birth, and so on; yet because in each such act of the physical body all the other bodies are also involved and brought into play in some degree or other, therefore consequences in that degree have to be undergone in the excarnate lives of those bodies. And, by special arrangement, while evil actions are expiated in Kāma-loka,

good deeds are reaped in Svarga.[1] The details and sub-divisions here, as elsewhere, are endless. There are two main divisions of Kāma-loka,

---

[1] The ideas contained in the text here and those of current theosophical literature may be made to supplement each other somewhat as follows: (1) The actor as such, of a sin or merit, is one, and he as one organic whole performs the act, the whole of his being comes into play in each such performance—this from the outer standpoint of the spectator, the third party. (2) But the actor is dual in nature, an inner core and an outer sheath, a conscious jīva, and a material body. And the conscious jīva, again, is represented by a material body at that stage of human evolution when sin and merit, karma in the special sense, the sense which implies bondage and emancipation, alternatives and choice, compelling motives and free-will, have become possible. (See *The Science of Peace*, p. 273.) But sin means predominance of the Eṭaṭ-consciousness, and merit—of the I-consciousness; and both are inseparably present in each jīva. Therefore this inner core-body is again sub-divided into a liṅga and a sūkshma, or a lower sūkṣhma and a higher sūkṣhma, or an astral and a mental, a kāma-lokika and a svargika—however we may prefer to word it. (3) In every act of sin, though the whole man is engaged, yet, also, the eṭaṭ-portion of the inner core, the liṅga or lower sūkṣhma or astral or

viz., A-kāma and Sa-kāma, and each of these has seven sub-divisions, and those again may be graded. So, also, Svarga has two main divisions, Sa-rūpa and A-rūpa, and each of these

---

kāma-lokika body is in more intense operation, while the other, the I-portion or higher Sūkṣhma or kāraṇa, is in comparative abeyance—on the psychic side belonging to the inner consciousness; the physical side, belonging to the outer body, being the external act of sin. Conversely, in every act of merit, the sūkṣhma or higher sūkṣhma or mental or svargika body is in operation while the other is in abeyance. (4) The result is that, in the endless chain and complication of causes and effects, events succeeding events, (*a*) while that portion of the act which is performed by the whole man is rewarded or punished in the next physical life of the whole man, (*b*) the psychic element of sin is punished in Kāma-loka, and (*c*) the psychic element of virtue rewarded in Svarga; and (*d*) all this, again, it must be remembered, is true only of the *human entity* whose *normal* life at this stage is the physical life, its post-mortem conditions being special conditions passed in *specially* prepared portions of the other worlds corresponding to his psychic bodies—even as jails or palaces on the physical plane are specially assigned to specially-qualified individuals. To other entities, normal inhabitants of those worlds, there is no such exclusive

is sub-divided seven times and each of these has finer sub-divisions, and so on endlessly. All these are enumerated in the *Veḍas,* but are in reality innumerable. The only thing that is possible is to form some vague idea of the less-

---

suffering or exclusive luxury; to those to whom those planes are their normal habitat, as the physical plane is to us, pain and pleasure, good and evil, sin and merit, are both possible, nay actual, on each of their respective planes, as to us on the physical.

With regard to the sub-divisions of planes or worlds mentioned in the succeeding sentences of the text, we may see that, if the views propounded in the preceding paragraph of this footnote are correct, they correspond to the physical and etheric sub-divisions of the physical plane or world, on the one hand, and the continents and countries of the physical world (and presumably similar sub-divisions of the etheric world) on the other. Animate and inanimate, or civilised and uncivilised, or earthly, aquatic, aërial etc., etc., and similar endlessly complicated sub-divisions have in all probability also their parallels on all the other planes. We have scores of names for these various planes and parts of planes, in the *Purāṇas*: Bhūrloka, Bhuvah, Svah, Mahah, Janah, Ṭapah, Saṭyam, Go-loka, Vaikuntha, Shiva-loka, Ruḍra-loka, Piṭṛ-loka, Preṭa-loka, Agṇi-loka, Vāyu-loka, Inḍra-loka, Varuṇa-loka, Sūrya-

known with the help of and by reasoning from the better-known. For those who wish to enter into this matter further and achieve the calculus of the incalculable, the study of *Bīja-gaṇiṭa* or algebra is prescribed.

But above and beyond and around all these endless details is the infinity and eternity and motionless calm of mokṣha, which, from Time's standpoint, is always being realised in part by the feeling of universal love, and in the remaining parts by corresponding thought and action. The more fully the three main appetites of the jīva fall away from him, the lok-eṣhaṇā, the appetite for the world, for life amidst our fellow-beings and for recognition by them, the viṭṭ-eṣhaṇā, the appetite for wealth, for enhanced bodily and material life, and the puṭr-eṣhaṇā, the appetite for multiplication, for the perpetuation of the individual life in and by progeny; corresponding to cognition, desire and action;—so more and more fully does the consciousness of peace and of emancipation grow towards perfection, till all separateness is negated and the Self alone is seen always and everywhere to reign supreme,

---

loka, Chanḍra-loka, Nāga-loka, Ganḍharva-loka, Aṭala, Viṭala, Suṭala, Ṭalāṭala, Rasāṭala, Mahāṭala, Pāṭāla, Ḍvīpas, Varṣhas, Āvarṭas, etc., etc.

And joy and sorrow, acts of sin and merit,
Virtue and vice, and truth and falsity,
Goodness and evilness, and love and hate,
Friendship and enmity, and mine and thine,
Heaven and hell, reward and punishment,
Bondage and liberation—all are lost
In One continuum, One shoreless vast,
One centred plenitude of Consciousness,
In One immensity of boundless Being,
In One eternity of Bliss, peace, AUM !

PEACE TO ALL BEINGS.

ॐ

शुभमस्तु सर्वजगताम्
सर्वो भद्राणि पश्यतु
लोकाः समस्ताः सुखिनो भवंतु ॥
ॐ

IN MEMORIAM

अहह घोरतरं नु किमाचरम्
दुरितमंतरितं प्रिय येन ते ।
सुनयनं सुनसं सततस्मितं
वदनकं मम दुर्भगचक्षुषोः ॥ १ ॥

नहि पदा पदमेकमथाक्रम-
स्त्वमु सहाययुतोऽपि धरातले ।
अहह दूरतमं हि महाऽध्वनाम्
कथमितोऽसि विहाय सहायकान् ॥ २ ॥

किमु मदाचरितैर्दुरनादरैः
कुसुमकोमलचित्त विषादितः ।
मयि विसृज्य रुजा कमलाऽमलं
मलिनदेहजनिं स्वतनुं गतः ॥ ३ ॥

प्रणयि ते हृदयं प्रतिचाटुभिः
नहि समर्चयतां पितरौ यतः ।

अपरकार्यरतौ कुगृहस्थका-
विति नु वत्स पितामहमव्रजः ॥ ४ ॥

दलति चित्तमपि ह्वलते मनः
चलति बुद्धिरहं ननु नश्यति ।
अपुनरागमनाय गतस्य ते
सुममुखं स्मरतोः स्मरसुंदरम् ॥ ५ ॥

गगनशांतगभीरविलोकितम्
तव शरद्घनचन्द्रसितस्मितम् ।
सलिलबुद्बुदहासविकूजितम्
कथमिव स्मरतोर्ध्रियते मनः ॥ ६ ॥

कदलिकानवपल्लवपेलवम्
लवलिकाफलवन्मसृणद्युति ।
तव सदा स्मरतोः शिशुकांगकम्
नहि धृतिं मनुते मन आवयोः ॥ ७ ॥

शिशुक शावक बालक तोकक
पृथुक डिम्भक देहज गर्भज ।
अहह नो शृणुषे लपितानि नौ
प्रति न कूजसि न स्मयसेऽपि वा ॥ ८ ॥

अहह कोमलकुंचितकुंतलम्
प्रतनुकर्णकमूर्मिसमाचितम् ।
सुचिबुकं पृथुदीप्तललाटकम्
मृदुकपोलदलं रुचिराधरम् ॥ ९ ॥

बृहदुरः सुकुमारतरोदरम्
मृदुलपीनभुजांसकशोभितम् ।
ललितपाटलपाणिपदांगुलिम्
सुरचितं नवपुष्पचयोपमम् ॥ १० ॥

दयित ते सुमनामुकुलं वपुः
अदयकालवशात्परिरक्षितुम् ।
नहि कथंचन हा यदपारयम्
स्मृतिवपुस्स्थितये तदहं यते ॥ ११ ॥

व्यथितजीवसमाश्वसनाय या
करुणमूर्तिमहर्षिकृतिः स्थिता ।
अपि तया सह बाल तव स्मृतिम्
व्यथितहृद्ग्रथये करुणोचितः ॥ १२ ॥

अविरतं हि मुनेर्हृदये दया
स्फुरति दीनशिशोरनुकंपया ।

सुकृतहीनतया यदि नाशकम्
स हि महान् अवने प्रभविष्यति ॥ १३ ॥

अपि मुने भवतोऽधिकसेवया
यदि सुतं बत नाऽलमपालयम् ।
कथमधीनजनस्य जने कृपा
नहि कृता भवतेति विमुह्यते ॥ १४ ॥

अहह तत्क्षमतां मम जल्पितम्
ननु दयामय वेद्मि तवेशितम् ।
किमु विनाशितनौ कृपया न वा
ऽमरकलेवरमस्य विधास्यासि ॥ १५ ॥

ज्ञानात्मनोऽनन्यभक्त्या
पुण्यं चेत्किंचिदार्जयम् ।
तन्मेऽस्तु मृतपुत्रस्य
सूर्यकांतस्य शांतये ॥ १६ ॥

प्रथयसेऽथ कथं वितथां कथाम्
स्थिरय मूढमनः शमचेतनाम् ।
नहि तवेव जनस्य दयामयम्
कृतकमाणवको ह्यनुजीवति ॥ १७ ॥

ननु कुलानि गृहाणि मनांसि नो
भगवतो वशतः प्रियकिंकरः ।
मम समीपमपि त्वमु पापिनो
दयित पावयितुं समवातरः ॥ १८ ॥

भसितलिप्ततनुं हसितेक्षणम्
परमशांतिसमध्युषिताननम् ।
गृहजनः स्वत एव विलोक्य यम्
ह्यनमदप्यवधूत इति ह्वयन् ॥ १९ ॥

मयि विदेशगते भृशतापिते
त्वयि रुजा स्वपती परमातुरा ।
निशि भवंतमवंतमलोकयत्
कमपि दिव्यजनं जननी तदा ॥ २० ॥

सुकृतलेशवशात्परजन्मनो
मम तवैव नु दुष्कृततोऽथवा ।

मयि जने मलिनेऽप्युषितः पुनः
गत इतो न समाप्य समात्रयम् ॥ २१ ॥

तव समागमनेन पवित्रिते
मम गृहे मुनिनेव वराशिषा ।
प्रणववाद इति श्रुतिपावनः
चिरविलुप्तकथः पुनरभ्युदैत् ॥ २२ ॥

अनुविधाय महेशनिदेशितम्
परमपावनशास्त्रसमापनम् ।
प्रतिनिवृत्त इमान्विधुराङ्गनान्
सदय पावयितुं पुनराव्रजेः ॥ २३ ॥

B

C

D

F

G

H

I

J

K

L

M

N

O

P

Q

R

S

TRIADS

A

B

C

D

E

G

H

I

L

M

N

O

P

R

S

T

U

V

Y

(TRIADS concluded)

U

W

OTHER WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE SCIENCE OF THE EMOTIONS. *2nd Edition* (1908).

Revised and Enlarged. Rs. 3-0-0.

TRANSLATIONS OF THIS WORK HAVE APPEARED IN

DUTCH, NORWEGIAN AND SPANISH

"... Bhagavan Das ... has for the first time introduced order into this hitherto confused region of consciousness ... A lucid treatise which reduces the chaos of the Emotions into a cosmos, and shapes therein an ordered morality."

ANNIE BESANT (*A Study in Consciousness*, p. 352.)

"The understanding that this book gives us of the relationships between our emotions, and of their effects upon others, renders us more, not less, sensitive to their presence, enriches, not pales, them. To the student of character, the correspondence and transmutation of the emotions and the method of practical application cannot but come as a revelation. The book, on this account alone, should be in the hands of every teacher, whether of children or of

older students, and of every person who is seeking to develop his own character or purify his personality. It is at once a pathway in the formerly trackless region of our intimate feelings, and a practical help in many familiar and difficult situations in life."

ERNEST WOOD (*The Theosophist*, April, 1909.)

"Apart from all questions of intrinsic merit or otherwise we cannot but regard the publication of such a book as an event of no mean importance... In our opinion it quite marks an era in the history of thought and of book-making in Modern India... Bhagavan Das has helped to lay the foundation of a modern philosophical literature in India, and he deserves our thanks... *The Science of the Emotions* is a work which is likely to afford readers much food for thought."

SATIS CHANDRA BANERJI, M.A., LL.D. (*Kayastha Samachar*, now incorporated with *The Hindustan Review*, September-October, 1901.)

"This is a small book, but it is important... A high ethical purpose runs through the book, which, moreover—considering that it is the work of an Indian—is written in remarkably good English."

Glasgow Herald.

"Mr. Das' dissection of human passions occasionally yields useful hints, and we recognise the kindliness of his tone."

The Literary Guide (*Times*, London.)

"This little work . . . really indicates considerable study and even originality of thought. It is a scholarly contribution to the psychology of the emotions, and its most pleasing feature is the attempt to reconcile western conceptions of mental philosophy with eastern thought . . . Whether his classification is a success or not, there is no doubt that he has brought to bear upon his task considerable powers of psychological analysis. We do not agree with the author in all the conclusions he arrives at; but we consider this little work a very thoughtful contribution to the study of the emotions from an oriental point of view. Mr. Bhagavan Das wields the English language with perfect ease and much force."

The Educational Review, Madras, September, 1901.

"This little volume is one of the most original and suggestive publications issued under the auspices of the Theosophical Society during recent years . . . The most interesting and original contribution which Mr. Bhagavan Das makes to the psychology of emotions is his attempt to classify them on a simple psychological principle . . . His work is sound and solid so far as it goes, and deserves a prominent place in contemporary psychological speculation. The chief aim of the author is distinctly ethical. The last chapter on the application of the science of emotions to the conduct of life is full of inspiring and elevating thoughts . . . We . . . trust that the readers of this volume may

find it of some help in the culture and regulation of their emotional nature, the soundness and purity of which lie at the root of human welfare.

The Indian Review, Madras, July, 1901.

THE SCIENCE OF PEACE Rs. 4-8-0

"The student should carefully study Bhagavan Das' *Science of Peace*, in which the metaphysical questions involved are expounded with rare acumen and felicity."

ANNIE BESANT (*A Study in Consciousness*, p. 6.)

Writing a series of articles on the subject, in *The Theosophist* (1909), Mrs. Annie Besant said in a prefatory note; "These articles are an exposition of one of the most valuable books issued under the inspiration of Theosophy, *The Science of Peace*, by Bhagavan Das. Those who seek a lasting intellectual foundation for their thinking will find much help from this valuable and original work."

THE SCIENCE OF SOCIAL ORGANISATION; OR THE LAWS OF MANU IN THE LIGHT OF THEOSOPHY Rs. 2-8-0.

Popular edition 1-8-0.

"Admirable Convention Lectures... A rare combination of deep learning and felicitous phrasing."

ANNIE BESANT (*Theosophy in India*, 1910.)

"This book, like others from the same pen, has the indefinable quality of distinction: subtlety and

precision of thought, scholarly culture and urbanity of expression all mingling to produce something eminently readable and provocative of reflection. A great subject has been presented in a clear and pleasant way . . . We are shown, with . . . admirable skill and lucidity, what Ḍharma meant to the age in which it was given. For those who look forward to a great revival of Indian spirituality, *The Science of Social Organisation* by Bhagavan Das is rich in instruction . . . An admirable organon of the new idealism, which, though new in its hopes and aspirations, is yet æonian in its sources, and which, through the cyclic process of the Āryan race, must eventually bring back all the scattered members of that race to the level of thought and aspiration from which many thousands of years ago, they started on their long journey . . . . . . A book of the highest excellence and value. . . . A work which is clearly the outcome of long years of thought and study, but which has also, just as clearly, been a labour of love."

PROF. E. A. WODEHOUSE, M. A. (OXON.)
(*The C. H. C. Magazine*, October, 1910.)

" A revelation . . . of the scientific principles which underlie our old social organisation . . . It has been a delight and an instruction to read the work."

MAHAMAHOPADHYAYA PANDIT ADITYARAM BHATTACHARYA, M. A., F. A. U., late Professor of Samskṛt, Muir College, Allahabad.

"... The *Manu* is simply grand ..."

RAI BAHADUR LALA BAIJNATH (Retired Judge, Author of many books.)

The Pranava-Vada; or the Science of the Sacred Word

A summarised reproduction in English of the original Samskṛt work of Gārgyāyaṇa. (3 Vols.)

" A short time ago I had the pleasure of reading the first part of the translation by Babu Bhagavan Das, of *Praṇava Vāḍa*, an ancient Samskṛt encyclopædic treatise of Hinḍū philosophy, by Gārgyāyaṇa... The author's labours of many years are yielding fruit by the rendering into English of the very technical and abstruse contents of this unique treatise. His elucidation of the many statements in the text, by ample and interesting annotations full of research, surpass in their value his work which gave to the world two highly important works—*The Science of the Emotions* and *The Science of Peace*. A perusal of this translation has enhanced my admiration for the translator's ability, learning and grasp of philosophic principles. Just as I was finishing the reading of the first part of the translation, there came to my hands another volume of his—*The Science of Social Organisation*—a work which appears to me

to be amongst the most illuminative contributions to the study and understanding of the all-important subjects it treats of."

SIR S. SUBRAMANIYA IYER, K. C. I. E. (Ex-Vice-President of the Theosophical Society, late Justice and officiating Chief Justice of the Madras High Court.)

CORRIGENDA

VOLUME I.

PAGE	LINE	FOR		READ:
xix	14	Paṇdiṭ	...	Paṇdit
xlii	12	Patañjali	...	Patañjali
xliii	1	Daṭṭa	...	Ḍaṭṭa
	7	Rhāṣhya	...	Bāṣhya
xliv	6	Gargyāyaṇa	...	Gārgyāyaṇa
xlv	6	khanda	...	khanda
xlvi	2 and 17	Datta	...	Datta
	No. 65	siddhanta	...	siddhānta
xlvii	5	Gorakpur		Gorakhpur
	No. 68	Vada	...	Vāda
lxxxiv	24	Tantra	...	Tantra
16	10	karma	...	kāma
17	14 and 20	vedanta	...	vedānta
46	16	smaraṇa	...	smaraṇa
47	15	development	...	development
58	10	desire, action	...	action, desire
72	20	kanstubha	...	kaustubha
105	11	arupa	...	arupa
107	21	Lyāsa	...	Vyāsa
116	23	Tantra	...	Tantra
142	2	sānta	...	santa
148	6 and 8	jivan	...	jivan
219	12	Prvnava	...	Praṇava
223	18	sāttviki	...	sattviki
230	26	maṇdlas	...	maṇdalas
232	5	conduct	...	conduct
290	26	Trishikha	...	Trishikha
322	11	samyak	...	samyag

PAGE	LINE	FOR		READ:
327	18	natural selection	...	heredity
347	21	xpansion	...	expansion
356	16	Sciencc	...	Science
369	28	Gobbili	...	Gobhili
377	25	Tândya	...	Ṭâṇḍya

VOLUME II.

PAGE	LINE	FOR		READ:
6	4	Upânishaṭs	...	Upanishaṭs
15	27	ṇirvaṇiṣ	...	nirvaṇis
17	27	insist	...	insist on
19	16	See the (Víshṇu	...	(See the Vishṇu
38	7	Shastra	...	Shâstra
43	18	doscription	...	description
46	28	on	...	in
51	29	Egoistic	...	egoistic
52	23	degenaration	...	degeneration
55	24	Veḍanṭa	...	Veḍânṭa
65	7	, or anger	...	or anger,
69	30	de-	...	des-
74	24	aud	...	and
78	25	Ḍhanrâj	...	Ḍhanarâja
79	28	of the	...	of Mahesha's
90	2	succeedence	...	succedence
115	10 and 18	Pravṛṭṭitâ	...	Pravṛṭṭiṭa
148	24	b h â v i k a	...	b h a v i k a
178	23	Its utmost, atomic selves, singular	...	Its utmost singular, atomic selves,
186	1	and intonations,	...	and of intonations
187	28	the	...	the slaughtered
188	10	,	...	is
"	29	The	...	They
190	13	pervasion	...	perversion

PAGE	LINE	FOR		READ:
220	11	Scheme,	...	Scheme
213	22	,	...	)
222	25	If, so,	...	If so,
248	26	love	...	love,
,,	14	Manifests	...	Manifests,
252	27	xiii.,	...	xiii.)
253	29	where in	...	wherein
272	1	samāhara	...	samāhāra
355	27	Kundālinī	...	Kunḍālinī
361	25	p r a ṭ i b i m b ā s	...	p r a ṭ i b i m b a s
,,	27	sound	...	sound,

VOLUME III.

PAGE	LINE	FOR		READ:
6	27	(of chiṭṭa,)	...	of chiṭṭa,
35	21	īva	...	jīva
38	19	bhrātṛtvena	...	bhrātṛṭvena
94	29	chchndaḥ	...	chhandaḥ
198	15	Dhātu-vāḍa	...	Ḍhāṭu-vāḍa
270	29	oka	...	loka